

The University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

JACKSON LIBRARY



CQ

no. 766

Gift of
Lynda K. Weant
COLLEGE COLLECTION

WEANT, LYNDIA KATHLEEN. Specific Tasks Required and Expected of Student Teachers in a Laboratory Nursery School. (1970)
Directed by: Dr. Helen Canaday. pp. 115

The purposes of the study were the following: (1) to identify the tasks and experiences required or expected of child development majors during their period of student teaching in a university or college laboratory nursery school; (2) to identify additional tasks and experiences required or expected by supervising teachers in the training provided student teachers; (3) to determine additional tasks and experiences that each supervising teacher believes should be included in the student teaching requirements; (4) to describe and compare the various laboratory nursery school programs offering preschool student teacher preparation in universities and colleges.

The subjects surveyed in the study were 100 supervising teachers in 60 universities and colleges in the United States. The survey instruments consisted of a questionnaire, which described the laboratory programs and teachers, and a checklist of tasks performed by student teachers in the programs. The reliability and validity of the checklist were not measured statistically. The data were analyzed descriptively in tabular form using percentages.

The data revealed that all of the laboratory programs provided for student teacher participation with four-year-old children. Ninety per cent provided participation with three-year-old children. Less than 25 per cent of the

programs involved students with socially, culturally, economically, and mentally deprived children. Over half of the supervising teachers did not require or expect the students to have experiences in tasks related to parent education, preparation of a meal, or supervision of the health check of the children participating in the program. Most of the teachers (85%) expected the students to perform maintenance duties. The purpose of doing these maintenance duties was to help the children learn to perform the tasks. Teaching techniques, supervision, and evaluation experiences received the highest percentages of response from the teachers. The use of strong physical force was the teaching technique that most (84%) teachers did not expect the students to use.

Additional tasks expected of students in the programs included: discuss and interpret children's behavior, plan weekly menus, write a case study of a child, assemble dress-up and other articles for children's activities, delegate responsibilities to other students in the room, keep a teaching journal.

Additional tasks which the teachers believed should be included in the programs were the following: visit, observe and participate in community child care programs; help plan nursery school budget; plan for visitors and observers in the laboratory program; use all campus and community resources in the planning of activities for the children; and plan menus and meals for the nursery school program.

SPECIFIC TASKS REQUIRED AND EXPECTED OF
STUDENT TEACHERS IN A LABORATORY
NURSERY SCHOOL

by

Lynda K. Weant

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Home Economics

Greensboro
May, 1970

Approved by

Thesis Adviser

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Adviser

Helene Canaday

Oral Examination
Committee Members

Osron J. Brounstein

Rebecca M. Smith

Mildred B. Johnson

May 6, 1970
Date of Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Helen Canaday, Associate Professor of Home Economics in the area of Child Development and Family Relationships and Director of the Nursery School, whose guidance and interest were valuable in the completion of this study; and to the four supervising teachers and nine student teachers at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, School of Home Economics Nursery School for their assistance in the development of the survey instruments.

For their invaluable suggestions, deepest appreciation is extended to the thesis committee members: Dr. Aaron Brownstein, Professor of Psychology; Dr. Mildred Johnson, Associate Professor of Home Economics and Chairman of the Area of Home Economics Education; and Dr. Rebecca Smith, Assistant Professor of Home Economics in the area of Child Development and Family Relationships.

Grateful acknowledge is given to the laboratory nursery school supervising teachers and directors who so graciously complied with the request to answer the questions on the instrument.

Finally, much appreciation is extended to Miss Lona M. Nash for her assistance in the preparation of the survey instrument; and to my family for their continuous support and trust.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purposes and Statement of the Problem.	3
Study Design	3
Basic Assumptions.	5
Definitions.	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Organization of the Thesis	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
Research Related to Student Teaching in the Laboratory Nursery School.	13
Research Related to the Training of the Student Teacher.	23
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	27
Selection of the Study Group	27
Development of the Task Checklist.	29
Development of the Questionnaire	31
Procedure for Analyzing the Data	32
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	33
The Laboratory Programs.	34
Description of the Various Types of Groups of Children in the Nursery School Programs.	38
Description of the Length of Time of Operation of the Nursery Schools	40

Chapter	Page
Description of Student Teacher Participation in the Nursery Schools . . .	41
Credit Hours for Student Teaching.	44
Number of Employees and Their Time Involved in Nursery Schools.	44
Tasks of Student Teachers in Nursery Schools.	47
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Creative Activity or Experience . . .	48
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Food Service.	50
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Care and Cleaning of Equipment and Supplies	51
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Planning.	55
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Supervision.	58
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Teaching Techniques.	60
Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Evaluation.	60
Responses to the Checklist Indicating Additional Tasks Expected or Required by Supervising Teachers.	63
Responses to the Checklist Indicating Additional Tasks Needed in the Laboratory Programs.	64
Summary and Interpretation of the Findings	64
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	71
Summary of Major Findings from the Questionnaire.	73
Summary of Major Findings from the Checklist.	75

Chapter	Page
Implications for Supervising Teachers. . . .	79
Recommendations for Further Research	81
Conclusion	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85
APPENDIXES	89
A. Letter of Introduction.	90
B. Postal Card Information	92
C. Follow-Up Letter.	94
D. Questionnaire	96
E. Guide for Checklist of Tasks.	100
F. Checklist of Tasks for Student Teachers	102
The Laboratory Schools	103
A. Duties and Maximum Number of Student Teachers Participating in the Laboratory Program	103
B. Class Levels of Student Teachers Participating in the Laboratory Program	104
C. Number of Weekly Contact Hours Expected Teachers Have with the Children.	105
D. Total Staff Members Employed in the Laboratory Schools	106
E. Number of Hours per Week Staff Members Participated in the Laboratory Schools	106
F. Qualitative Analysis of Supervision Expected of Students of Student Teachers	107
G. Total Expected Experiences Required as Expected of Student Teachers.	108
H. Hours and Licensing of Employees and Qualities Experiences Required or Expected of Student Teachers	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Educational Background of Supervising Teachers Presented in Percentage	35
2. Years Experience of the Supervising Teacher in the Laboratory Nursery School	36
3. Supervising Teachers' Responsibilities Other than the Laboratory Nursery School	37
4. The Types of Children in the 100 Laboratory Programs and the Percentage of Groups in Which the Student Teachers Participate	39
5. Number of Hours per Day and Days per Week the Laboratory Schools Operate	40
6. Present and Maximum Number of Student Teachers Participating in Laboratory Programs	41
7. Class Levels of Student Teachers Participating in the Laboratory Programs	42
8. Number of Weekly Contact Hours Student Teachers Have with the Children.	43
9. Paid Staff Members Employed in the Laboratory Schools	45
10. Number of Hours per Week Staff Members Participated in the Laboratory Schools	46
11. Creative Activity or Experience Required or Expected of Student Teachers	49
12. Food Service Experience Required or Expected of Student Teachers.	51
13. Care and Cleaning of Equipment and Supplies Experience Required or Expected of Student Teachers	52

Table	Page
14. Planning Experience Required or Expected of Student Teachers.	56
15. Supervision Experience Required or Expected of Student Teachers.	59
16. Teaching Techniques Required or Expected of Student Teachers.	61
17. Evaluation	62

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Colleges and universities throughout the United States have provided laboratory nursery schools since soon after the turn of the century. The purposes for having laboratory nursery schools have not always been the same. Some purposes of laboratory nursery schools are to provide an opportunity for students in child development to observe children, to conduct child development research, and to train students to teach young children.

What experiences and training should the teacher have in order to teach nursery school? Sigel (1957) summarized the variety of academic and practical experiences that the student teacher in preschool education needs in the following statement:

The teacher should be trained in the basic social sciences of psychology, sociology, anthropology. With a firm foundation here, she should then have academic and practical experience in the working with children, developing program, and handling parents. In this practical experience, the student teacher should be asked to examine critically her concepts, her values, her ideas. She should be encouraged to utilize her critical facilities and not just those given. The need for critical evaluation of practices, and procedure is imperative. Supervisors should encourage such examination. No supervisor should avoid, discourage or deemphasize vigorous examination. The motto of the student and the supervisor should be "Why do we do this?" Further, interpretation of academic and practical

experience in depth and breadth is necessary. In this way, we might achieve a greater degree of agreement between what we say we do and what we actually do (Sigel, 1957, p. 20).

Requirements for nursery school teaching have become more comprehensive in that teachers have experience with not only the academic but the social and practical disciplines. "Nursery school teachers are educators, not glorified babysitters (Sigel, 1957, p. 18)." The importance of teacher education today was expressed by Bell when she stated that:

Teacher education is beginning to be recognized for what it is--a force of such social and political importance that it cannot remain laggard, obsolete, or ineffective (Bell, 1970, p. 34).

Empirical data summarizing the tasks and experiences required or expected of student teachers in various pre-school laboratory programs could be of value to the personnel in teacher training programs in that it would provide them with a means for comparing the professional training they are providing with other similar programs. Through the identification of the tasks expected of the student teachers in laboratory programs, a description of the preparation which these students receive would be made available. No such identification or description has been readily available to the professionals in the area of child growth and development.

During the training program in the laboratory nursery school, the student teacher learns the duties and responsibilities one might be expected to perform as a teacher of

preschool children. In this study an attempt was made to identify these responsibilities.

Purposes and Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this study were the following: (1) to identify the tasks and experiences required or expected of child development majors during their period of student teaching in a university or college laboratory nursery school; (2) to identify additional tasks and experiences required or expected by the supervising teachers in the training provided student teachers; (3) to determine additional tasks and experiences that each supervising teacher believes should be included in the student teaching requirements; and (4) to describe and compare the various laboratory nursery school programs offering preschool student teacher preparation in universities and colleges.

The use of teaching tasks as a criterion measurement of teacher training in the nursery school was based upon the premise expressed by Bell (1970):

Much of teaching consists of acts or behaviors. It is conceded that attitudes, personality, intelligence, and many other factors affect the success of a teacher. However, all of these factors contribute to produce certain acts or behaviors of teachers (Bell, 1970, p. 35).

Study Design

The instrument used for this study was composed of a questionnaire and a checklist. The questionnaire was

developed with the purpose of describing the laboratory nursery school programs in colleges and universities in the United States. The questionnaire was formulated from a compilation of the ideas and questions posed by the director and four supervising teachers at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in the School of Home Economics Nursery School.

The second part of the instrument was a checklist which provided information describing the tasks that were required or expected of student teachers by the supervising teachers in the laboratory nursery school programs. The 102 tasks included in the checklist were obtained from several sources. Suggestions of tasks to be included in the list were secured from a preliminary survey which was conducted at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in the School of Home Economics Nursery School. The director, supervising teachers, graduate assistants and students were asked to list specific tasks expected of the student teachers in the program. Additional tasks in the checklist were obtained from a review of related literature and from interviews with professional persons engaged in teaching young children.

The checklists and questionnaires were mailed to 195 supervising teachers in 84 participating laboratory nursery schools in the United States. Data were compiled from the questionnaires and the checklist and were analyzed descriptively.

Basic Assumptions

These basic assumptions made in relation to this study were the following:

1. University and college laboratory nursery schools provide meaningful experiences for student teachers in preparation for work outside of the laboratory situation.
2. Supervising teachers will record accurately their practices as they relate to the specific tasks that student teachers are required or expected to do.
3. University and college laboratory nursery schools differ in scope and purpose and also differ in the task requirements of their student teachers.

Definitions

The following terms are defined according to their use in this study:

Laboratory nursery school is a planned group experience within a university or college setting for children two through five years of age.

Teaching training program is a program in which students are being trained in methods and procedures of teaching in the nursery school.

Student teacher is the college or university student who is receiving special training in methods and procedures

of teaching in the nursery school.

Supervising teacher is the university or college staff member who is responsible for the performance of the laboratory experience by the students preparing to be nursery school teachers.

Task is the experience or duty assigned to and required or expected of student teachers in the laboratory nursery school.

Involvement refers to the student's participation in tasks assigned or required by the supervising teachers as well as those requested by the student teachers.

Preschool and nursery school will be used interchangeably in this study.

Limitations of the Study

The survey was limited to those colleges and universities which offered a child development degree and had supervised student teaching in a laboratory nursery school. No follow-up attempt was made to secure responses from all to whom questionnaires were mailed.

Shortly after the introductory letters describing the study were mailed to the directors of the laboratory nursery school programs, a mail strike took place. Conceivably some directors may not have received the letters.

Organization of the Thesis

A review of literature relative to the development of

and purpose for having nursery schools in colleges and universities in the United States and the objectives and expectations of the student teaching experiences are presented in Chapter II. The design and procedure followed in this study are explained in Chapter III. The findings and interpretation of the data are presented in Chapter IV. Chapter V includes a summary of the study with implications and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A survey of the existing literature disclosed a dearth of empirical data directly related to the experiences provided for student teachers during their student teaching experience in the laboratory nursery school. Research focusing directly upon the student teaching program has been practically nonexistent, but research relating to adult-child interaction has provided the criterion on which to base course requirements and expectations. Research highly relevant to a student teaching program has been carried out by recent studies (Christianson, Ludlum, and Rogers, 1961; Haskell, 1966; Kingsley, 1966; Rubow, 1968). Descriptive data concerning tasks expected of student teachers in the nursery school have been provided by other researchers (Landreth, 1942; Langdon, 1933; Moustakas and Berson, 1966; Read, 1966).

Laboratory schools were instituted as early as 1915 for a variety of purposes and to fulfill a diversity of needs. These purposes included the provision of facilities for the observation of young children's behavior by students and researchers, for student research, and for the training of teachers in preschool education. From 1920 to 1930 the

number of nursery schools in the United States increased from three to 262 (Davis and Hansen, 1933, p. 1). Reasons for this growth of nursery schools and concern for the education of the young child were cited by Davis and Hansen (1933) as follows:

The general concern that each individual be given opportunity to start life fortified with adequate emotional controls and social adjustments. . . . That this is possible has been shown in the marked increase in knowledge of the potential learning abilities of young children and in the development of techniques for the conditioning of behavior . . . the movement of population toward cities has placed certain social and economic limitations upon family life. . . . Parents want the best environment for their children and are seeking guidance in their profession of parenthood and cooperation in the supervision of their children's development (Davis and Hansen, 1933, p. 1).

One of the earliest laboratory nursery schools to become affiliated with a university was at the University of Chicago in 1915. A group of interested mothers formed a cooperative nursery school in which the mothers shared the daily care and supervision of the children. The purposes of this cooperative school were to provide the opportunity for children to have a group experience and to give the mothers some time free from the care of children. This original cooperative school became a part of the University of Chicago in 1915, and the facilities were made available for the observation of the children by the students at the University (Landreth, 1942). Gesell began to study children in the Yale Psychology Clinic in 1920, and the Iowa Child Welfare

Research Station opened at the State University of Iowa in October, 1921. It was under the direction of Dr. Bird T. Baldwin (Moustakas and Berson, 1966).

The opening of laboratory nursery schools associated with home economics departments was influenced by:

A bequest of a Detroit woman, Elizabeth Merrill Palmer, which in 1922 established a school for the teaching of homemaking and care of young children to girls in Detroit under the direction of a home economist Edna Noble White. This school instituted a research and teaching program and attracted undergraduate students from land-grant colleges who substituted a semester's work in Merrill-Palmer School for one semester of their four year degree course (Landreth, 1942, p. 8).

In 1922 the Ruggles Street Nursery School in Boston was organized under the direction of Dr. Abigail A. Eliot with the primary objective that of training nursery school teachers. Alumnae demands for a different type of education for women students resulted in a Department of Euthenics at Vassar in 1923. A nursery school was organized at Vassar in 1926, soon after the development of the Department of Euthenics. The purpose of the Vassar Nursery School was that of "giving both undergraduates and graduates an opportunity to learn more about children and homemaking (Landreth, 1942, p. 8)." Teacher education thus became one of the objectives of the early laboratory nursery school program in universities and colleges.

The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund made available, in 1923, grants of money for the development of

child study centers at a number of universities. It aided in the growth of laboratory programs in these universities. Some of the programs affected by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund included institutes of child welfare at Columbia University, Minnesota State University and California State University.

Each of these (universities) originally had as its main laboratory a nursery school for children two to five years of age. Though their interest was primarily in research, university departments of psychology, education, and home economics soon became aware of the laboratory possibilities such schools offered for their students. This led to the progressive establishment of nursery schools in universities through the country (Landreth, 1942, p. 7-8).

In 1923 the University of California at Los Angeles, under the direction of Miss Barbara Greenwood, established a kindergarten to provide educational opportunities for young children, child study programs for parents, and the facilities for the observation and participation of kindergarten-primary education students. Other universities and state teachers colleges followed with the development of laboratory nursery school programs (Davis and Hansen, 1933).

Early child development research had implications for preschool teacher education by substantiating theories of methods of child guidance, discipline, and growth. In 1938 Frank (In Gage, 1963) emphasized the necessity of relating learning to a child's individual needs. The Gesell studies (1943) reported the developmental characteristics of children at different age levels. An understanding of the

importance of each age level of the child was a precedent to the understanding of individual rates of growth. Spock (1946) maintained that a child learns faster if allowed to proceed at his own rate.

A study by Thompson in 1944 emphasized the importance of teacher presence and contact with the children. This research was directly related to teacher preparation in the nursery school laboratory. He compared two groups of nursery school children involved in two different curricula programs. The children in group A had very little teacher contact or intervention and were allowed to play and interact freely without guidance or direction. Group B had active participation by the teacher who, in contrast to the teacher in group A, offered assistance when the need was expressed by the child; showed interest and encouragement for the child's activities; and displayed disapproval towards unsociable behavior. The two groups were rated according to a five area personality analysis as follows: constructive-ness, ascendancy, destructiveness, participation, and leadership. The findings showed that after an eight month period, group B was more constructive, more ascendent, less destructive, and showed more participation and leadership than group A.

Lambert (1961) noted that the teacher in the learning environment was as important as the facility. He suggested that:

One of the most important tasks in teacher education is the selection and preparation of teachers capable of managing the varied teaching tasks expected of them. . . . The way a teacher works with a group of children not only affects her relationships with them but also the children's relationships with each other (Lambert, 1961, p. 131).

Sigel (1957) emphasized the incorporation of research findings in child development (such as those already described) in the training of teachers in preschool education:

We know from sociology and social psychology, for example, that variation in child rearing practices exists among the social class groups. We know that children coming from these different socio-economic backgrounds have different attitudes toward authority, have different experiences with materials and equipment, have differential amounts of familial interaction. We know that the size of the family is a factor in influencing the child. We are beginning to learn that the different methods of influencing or modifying children's behavior have differential effects. These are things we know. These are things that should be increasingly integrated into the nursery school teacher's perspective on the nursery school program (Sigel, 1957, p. 23).

Research Related to Student Teaching in the Laboratory Nursery School

Langdon (1933) was a pioneer in the study of tasks and experiences that are expected of the student teachers in the laboratory nursery school program. In her study, Langdon formulated a task checklist from observations of the actions of teachers in nursery school, kindergarten, and first grades at Columbia University and the surrounding community. This checklist was mailed to teachers of public,

private, and university nursery schools, kindergartens, and first grades to determine the similarities and differences in teaching acts and techniques used at these three different age levels. The findings suggested that:

Whether one believes that education is training for unquestioned acceptance of a set behavior pattern for specific situations and stereotyped conformity to a mass standard, or whether one believes that education is guidance in the development of self-direction, self-control, intelligent planning, initiative, independence, and adaptability, one is constantly selecting techniques as skilled ways of meeting a situation, those ways having been refined through use, and reflecting a controlling theory. This controlling theory is not only reflected in the technique employed but is, in turn, the mean for evaluating the results obtained. However, there can be no rigid final classification, for the same technique might conceivably be used by teachers of opposing philosophies, the way it was used determining the result (Langdon, 1933, p. 314).

Langdon's (1933) findings indicated that there was a difference in the acts and techniques used by the teachers in the nursery school as compared with the acts and techniques of teachers of kindergarten and first grade. The nursery school teachers gave more physical assistance and encouragement to the children, provided more play experiences, and performed more tasks related to helping the child learn routine skills and habit-training. The following recommendation was made by Langdon as a result of the study:

Teacher training courses should include not only opportunities for rich and varied experiences in active contact with children of the various age levels, but opportunities for the detailed and critical analysis of the various situations arising in terms of the consequent techniques employed (Langdon, 1933, p. 282).

Other research related to teaching in the laboratory nursery school has been described by Landreth (1942) and Read (1966). Landreth (1942) indicated that a student teacher gained a knowledge of the individuality of human development through the planning of tasks suitable to a child's growth patterns. Read (1966, p. 1) described the modern laboratory nursery school in colleges and universities in much the same manner. She termed it a "human relationships laboratory" which involves a richness and variety of opportunities where the student teacher can learn to plan to meet the individual needs of children (Read, 1966, p. 8).

Teacher preparation in the laboratory nursery school has been the concern of recent studies in education because of the interest in making the student teaching experience more individualized and personalized. One such study concerning the individualization of the student teaching experience was completed by Haskell in 1965. Students in Wheelock College, Boston were trained in 1964-65 in an experimental teacher preparation program in nursery, kindergarten, and the primary grades. The purpose of the program was to provide more individualized instruction for the student teachers and more opportunity for them to take the initiative in flexible preschool programs. This was in contrast to programs stressing proficiency and skill in learning techniques and methods in the programs (Haskell, 1966).

The student teaching experience took place four mornings a week. They were supervised by their instructor and were placed in a variety of teaching situations including private nursery schools, day care centers, and public school kindergartens. A variety of resources in the college and community were made available to the student teachers, but they were given freedom to create, plan and teach programs for young children (Haskell, 1966).

The results showed that many mistakes were made in the program. Not enough use was made of the facilities and resources which were made available to the student teachers. It was recommended that future teacher preparation programs could be more individualized. If freedom and responsibility are given to the student teachers, a sense of purpose and challenge must be instilled in the student by the instructors. However, adequate guidance must also be necessary to the success of such a program (Haskell, 1966).

Another study concerning the individualization of student teaching was carried out by Kingsley (1966) at Jersey City State College, New Jersey. Through observation, the role that a supervisor performs in helping a student teacher learn to teach children was studied. The two most important ways in which this was done was by setting an example of what a real teacher was in all of his relationships with the student teacher, and by knowing when and how to help the student teacher learn specific techniques in

working with children. The amount of direction to be given the student teacher, and the amount to be expected or required in the student teaching program was examined:

Enough framework and support are essential; too much direction restricts the student and too little leaves him uncertain about how to proceed. Often a supervisor can suggest a way, but he must do it in such a manner as to leave the student free to make his own choices. . . . The best learning is through discovery for oneself. . . . The supervisor will do everything he can to help a student have successful and satisfying experiences, but it takes a long time to acquire the many skills that make for good teaching (Kingsley, 1966, p. 402).

Sell (1967) studied teacher preparation also, but she emphasized how the laboratory nursery school offered training for future teachers at any grade level. Sell interviewed student teachers at University Nursery School, Detroit, and teachers in Detroit elementary schools. From the interviews, Sell found that both the student teachers and the elementary school teachers were in agreement that the nursery school was a valuable training situation for any level of teaching since it involved a basic experience in teaching techniques and human relationships. Sell stated that:

The student teacher can learn much about the fundamentals of classroom organization involving direction of staff, drawing up plans for children's experiences, making evaluations and preparing materials and facilities. In this respect, the nursery school experience is a fine training ground for planning skills which will be needed at any grade level. And the deep understanding gained of the very young child will help sensitize the student teacher to the needs of the older students that she may deal with in her career as a teacher (Sell, 1967, p. 517).

The evaluation of student teaching in the laboratory nursery school was a concern of the supervisors and directors in the program. Evaluation involves the individual teacher's attitudes and initiative as well as the manner in which she fulfilled the requirements and expectations of the course in student teaching. Rockwell and Bittner (1967) formulated an observation rating form which they recommended for use in the training of student teachers in colleges and universities that train students in preschool education. The evaluation form used in the study was comprised of observations of teacher aides who were trained how to interact with children.

Rockwell and Bittner (1967) developed this evaluation form as a result of a program to prepare Head Start personnel for teaching. The study was conducted in November, 1965 at the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections of Southern Illinois University. The primary goal of the study was to develop materials and methods for training unemployed youth and Aid-to-Dependent-Children mothers as preschool teacher aides.

The results of the teacher-aide training program were obtained by the evaluation form developed by Rockwell and Bittner (1967). The findings indicated that the most effective students were actively involved with the children. The top students also had a high percentage of interaction with co-workers and supervised children's activities cooperatively.

It was suggested that the evaluation form used in the study could be of value in the training of student teachers in preschool education in colleges and universities.

Another study of the training and evaluation of student teachers in preschool education was carried out by Rubow (1968). To determine the most effective teacher training technique, Rubow compared three training methods used with teacher aides working in preschool classrooms over a twelve week period. Thirty-two aides in Coahoma County, Mississippi were randomly selected from a population of 88 aides for participation in the study. These selected aides were then randomly assigned by the center to each of three treatment groups. The first group was a participation group in which the aides participated in the classroom with the children. The second group was a lecture-discussion group in which the aides were given classroom training in planning and teaching techniques but were not given the opportunity for active participation with the children. The third group was an eclectic group which included both the lecture-discussion sessions and participation with the children. A group for comparison was also included in the study.

Three evaluation instruments were used to measure the change between the three treatment groups: a semantic differential to measure changes in attitudes, a rater observation scale to measure the amount and kind of interaction between the aides and the children, and an objective test to

measure knowledge of preschool curriculum, classroom organization and child development (Rubow, 1968).

The analysis of the data measured by the rater observation scale indicated more verbal positive reinforcement observed for teacher aides in the experimental treatment groups than for aides in the comparison group. It was suggested by the study that in-service training of teacher aides which involved both classroom experience and lecture-discussion sessions had a greater influence upon teacher aide reinforcement behavior in the classroom than training which involved either classroom experience or lecture discussion sessions independently. Aides benefited most from teaching techniques that were concrete in nature. A high correlation was found between classroom performance of the teacher and the classroom performance of her aides. Rubow (1968) suggested that there was a:

. . . crucial need to provide a systematic evaluation program for the personnel working within the Child Development Program. Knowledge of the educational level, attitudes, learning style, and teaching needs based on classroom performance necessitates the development of carefully planned programs of evaluation in order that in-service training can have a real impact on the effectiveness of the personnel in the classroom (Rubow, 1968, p. 11).

Cornick (1968) studied the amount of involvement that young children had in the performance of certain tasks in the laboratory preschool program. Her study offered comparative data for the understanding of the interaction between teacher and child and the amount and type of task

performance of each in the nursery school program. Cornick mailed 200 questionnaires and checklists to 73 university laboratory nursery schools in the United States. The checklist was devised so that the supervising teachers in the laboratory schools could indicate their practices of providing opportunity for the children to be involved in each of 65 tasks. Of the 200 checklists mailed, 139 supervising teachers responded. The findings revealed that 80 per cent of the teachers provided opportunity for the children to be involved in tasks related to the selection and return of materials and equipment. Only 33 per cent of the teachers involved the children in tasks related to the care and repair of equipment. One of the recommendations from the study was that:

New studies should be initiated in institutions involved in teacher education in early childhood to identify and evaluate experiences provided for university students to learn to plan programs that meet the needs of young children in group living (Cornick, 1968, p. 25).

The recent use of programmed materials in education could influence the training method of student teachers in preschool education because of the developmental sequence in planning tasks and teaching techniques. An example of such a training method is that used in microteaching research conducted in 1967-68 at Texas Tech University under the direction of Bell (1970). A task-oriented approach was used in the training of student teachers in home economics

education. The basic premise of microteaching was that:

Much of teaching consists of acts or behaviors. It is conceded that attitudes, personality, intelligence, and many other factors affect the success of a teacher. However, all of these factors contribute to produce certain acts or behaviors of teachers (Bell, 1970, p. 39).

The purpose of Bell's (1970) study was to determine the effect of microteaching upon specific skills of 22 student teachers in home economics education. These 22 students were divided into a control group and an experimental group. The lessons that each student teacher planned and taught to ninth grade students were videotaped, replayed, and analyzed by the student teachers. Five task techniques were emphasized: establishing set, reinforcing, questioning, achieving closure, and framing reference. The Teacher Performance Appraisal Scale (TPAS) was used by six judges who were professional teachers in the evaluation of improvement of the teaching experience of student teachers as a result of the microteaching technique. An analysis of the data from the scores made on the TPAS revealed that the experimental group receiving the videotaped evaluation of lessons scored higher than did the control group. The conclusions were the following:

In essence, student teachers who had microteaching training in addition to both the traditional student teaching and prestudent teaching experiences are better prepared to be effective homemaking teachers. . . . There is now a glimmer of hope that the complex act of teaching can be structured and dealt with by use of a rational and scientific approach (Bell, 1970, p. 39).

Research Related to the Training
of the Student Teacher

What experiences and responsibilities should the student teacher in the laboratory nursery school have to acquire the best preparation for future work with young children? Although specific preparation requirements for nursery school teachers are not provided for in all states, there are several research studies that offer suggestions for those planning the student teaching curriculum, requirements, and expectations.

A survey made in the fall of 1967 (Stith and Hoeflin) assessed the requirements and provisions for certification of nursery school teachers in 50 states. The study summarized information from 44 states and showed that 33 had no such provisions. The Kansas Advisory Council on Education appointed a committee to make suggestions for nursery school teacher requirements and the results identified the following areas of needed competency:

Knowledge of human development, knowledge of learning processes of young children, knowledge of community organization and resources, knowledge of parent-child relationships and family life education, skill in relating to young children (Stith and Hoeflin, 1967, p. 371).

Bliss (1958) studied certification requirements for teachers of nursery schools and suggested that student teachers need a thorough knowledge of the responsibilities and duties expected of them in teaching young children.

Also techniques of counseling and guidance would help the inexperienced student teacher in dealing with personality and behavior problems of young children. The student teacher would then better understand her own abilities and qualifications so that she could adequately assess her future job potential in a nursery school. The Colorado State Kindergarten Committee (1960) also emphasized counseling and guidance but described preparation for teaching as a "continuous process . . . a teacher who is dedicated to her task will work to be qualified to the best of her ability (Colorado State Department of Education, 1960, p. 12)."

A statement by the American Association for Childhood Education International Teacher Education Committee (1958) also offered suggestions for nursery school teacher certification requirements. A minimum of 24 semester hours professional preparation in the specialized field of Early Childhood Education was expected. The amount of time that the committee expected student teachers to have supervised experiences with young children was 8-12 semester hours or approximately 360 clock hours.

The learning experiences or responsibilities of student teachers in the nursery school were researched and reviewed by Christianson, Ludlum, and Rogers (1961), Haskell (1966), Rockwell and Bittner (1967), Sell (1967), and Witherspoon, (1958).

The student teacher in the laboratory nursery school

learns to observe children objectively. The student learns to plan for individual differences in child behavior and to prepare materials for use by the children. This preparation may include arranging the sandbox for play, making the housekeeping corner inviting, and readying the room for snacks or rest. The responsibilities and duties that are expected of each staff member and the attitudes and personal characteristics most conducive to the teaching of young children are realized by the student during her teaching experience. In the teacher preparation course, the future teacher should realize the importance of curriculum planning, program planning, scheduling, and administrative organization in the preschool situation (Christianson, Rogers, Ludlum, 1961).

Sell stated that the student learns a sensitivity to children: "In the nursery school one learns to respond to the full range of human communication: facial expressions, gestures, body movements, sounds, scribbles (Sell, 1967, p. 516)." Rockwell and Bittner (1967) suggested that the student must learn the teaching techniques that produce positive growth and development of the child. Haskell (1966) expressed the need for an understanding of the relationship between theory and practice in the teaching of young children. He also recommended that students should learn to develop their capacities to think and act for themselves in constructive, acceptable ways. A knowledge of the available

resources and professional associations related to preschool education was also needed by student teachers.

Witherspoon (1958) emphasized the importance of understanding the development of the self-concept in children and realizing that "the teacher, and what he himself is, plays a significant role in the self-concept developed by those he teaches (Witherspoon, 1958, p. 56)."

Experiences recommended in the review of child development research are necessary in the preparation of teachers in preschool education. The more and varied experiences that the students can have in the laboratory nursery school can help the students to develop adequate teaching skills in preparation for future positions in preschool programs.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the tasks and experiences that are required or expected of child development majors during their period of student teaching in a university or college laboratory nursery school. A second purpose was to identify additional tasks and experiences required or expected by supervising teachers in the training of student teachers. Two additional purposes of the study were to determine additional tasks and experiences that each supervising teacher believes should be included in the student teaching requirements and to describe and compare the various laboratory nursery school programs offering preschool teacher preparation in universities and colleges. The purposes were accomplished through the use of prepared questionnaires (see Appendix D) and checklists of tasks (see Appendix E) which were mailed to the directors of a selected group of university and college laboratory nursery schools in the United States. A letter of explanation and instruction (see Appendix C) was included with the questionnaires and checklists mailed.

Selection of the Study Group

There were 190 colleges and universities in the United

States eligible to participate in the study. The 190 names of colleges and universities were obtained from the College Blue Book (1969) and from the list of Land-Grant Universities (1969). A complete list of colleges or universities with laboratory nursery schools used in the training of student teachers was unavailable therefore these two sources were used. A letter (see Appendix A) was mailed to the director or the staff person responsible for the administration of each of the laboratory nursery schools. The letter contained a description of the proposed study. The director was asked to express a willingness to distribute an instrument to the supervising teachers in the laboratory program to fill in and return. Some laboratory programs had more than one supervising teacher. A postal card (see Appendix B) was enclosed with the letter. On the postal card the director could indicate a willingness on the part of the staff to cooperate in the study and also indicate the number of supervising teachers in that specific program. Each respondent had to be a supervising teacher of students in preschool education in a university or college laboratory nursery school.

Of the 190 university and college laboratory schools which were mailed the introductory letter, 84 (44%) laboratory schools responded in the affirmative and requested 195 task checklists and questionnaires; 23 (12%) indicated no laboratory program was operating at the present time; 11 (6%)

indicated that they would not be able to participate; and 72 (38%) did not respond. Shortly after the letters were mailed, a mail strike took place. It could be that letters were never received by some colleges or universities.

A total of 195 task checklists and questionnaires were sent to the supervising teachers in the 84 laboratory schools who indicated a willingness to participate in the study. The analysis of data was based on 100 checklists and questionnaires which were returned. The 100 respondents represented 60 laboratory nursery schools in college and universities in the United States.

Development of the Task Checklist

The original list of tasks was obtained from a preliminary survey which was conducted at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in the School of Home Economics Nursery School. The director, four supervising teachers, two graduate assistants, and nine student teachers were asked to list the tasks that were (1) required of all student teachers, (2) engaged in by the student teachers upon the request of the supervising teacher, (3) engaged in by the student teachers because of individual request or need, (4) never experienced by the student teacher, or (5) not applicable. These five responding areas were designed in order to gather data to fulfill the first three purposes of the study.

Additional tasks for the checklist were obtained from interviews with other professional persons working with young children and from the reports of such studies as Langdon's Checklist of Teaching Acts in Nursery School, Kindergarten, and First Grade (1933); LINC Learning Institute of North Carolina's Teacher Observation Form (Nimnicht, McAfee, and Meier, 1960); and Cornick's Checklist of Tasks in Which Children Participate in the Nursery School Program (1968). A review of literature also provided examples of tasks performed by preschool teachers (Bliss, 1958; Christianson, Ludlum, and Rogers, 1961; Lowe, 1965; and Moustakas and Berson, 1966).

The suggested tasks were then compiled into a comprehensive list of 86 tasks performed by the student teacher in the laboratory nursery school. The preliminary checklist consisting of 86 tasks was pretested by a group of students enrolled in Supervised Teaching in the Nursery School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to fill in the information called for. The students were instructed to follow the directions given, to ask questions, and to make additions, corrections, or suggestions. New tasks were then added from this information. All of the tasks were categorized into seven areas of participation: (A) Creative activity or experience, (B) Food service, (C) Care and cleaning of equipment and supplies, (D) Planning, (E) Supervision, (F) Teaching techniques, and (G) Evaluation.

All suggestions were considered and changes were incorporated in the final checklist which included 102 tasks. The checklist in its final form can be found in Appendix E. The reliability and validity of the checklist was not determined. Validity of the checklist was based upon the consistency of the responses to the pretest by the student teachers in the Nursery School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Reliability of the checklist was based upon the assumption that supervising teachers as professional persons in laboratory schools will record accurately their practices as they relate to the specific tasks that student teachers are required or expected to do.

Development of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed with the purpose of describing the various laboratory nursery school programs in colleges and universities in the United States which offer teacher preparation in nursery schools. The director and four supervising teachers at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in the School of Home Economics Nursery School were consulted as to the amount and type of information about the respondents and their programs that should be included in the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to gather data for fulfilling the fourth purpose of the study, which was to describe and compare the various laboratory nursery schools' programs offering preschool

student teacher preparation in universities and colleges.

Procedure for Analyzing the Data

The nature of the survey and the small number of responses in some phases made the use of statistical tests of significance inappropriate. Thus, the data were analyzed descriptively using numbers and percentages.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The questionnaire and checklist data are presented in tabular form, described and interpreted in the present chapter. The data from the checklist were used to fulfill the first three purposes of this study: (1) to identify the tasks and experiences required or expected of child development majors during their period of student teaching in a university or college laboratory nursery school; (2) to identify additional tasks and experiences required or expected by the supervising teachers in the training provided student teachers; and (3) to determine additional tasks and experiences that each supervising teacher believes should be included in the student teaching requirements. The data from the questionnaire were used to fulfill the fourth purpose of this survey. This fourth purpose was to describe and compare the various laboratory nursery school programs offering preschool student teacher preparation in universities and colleges. The data from the questionnaire presents an overview of the variety in the 60 laboratory schools and among the 100 respondents included in this survey.

The Laboratory Programs

To be included in this study, each respondent had to be the supervising teacher of students in preschool education in a laboratory nursery school. The 100 respondents represented 60 laboratory nursery schools.

The educational background of the supervising teacher is described in Table 1. The table presents the major fields and the percentage of the respondents whose highest degree was the bachelor's, master's or doctor's in each field.

Seventy-six per cent of the responding supervising teachers had master's degrees. The greatest majority of those with master's degrees had majored in childhood education. Twenty-two per cent of the respondents held bachelor's degrees with half of these having majors in childhood education. Only one laboratory teacher had a doctoral degree and her major was in childhood education.

The data describing the teaching experience of the supervising teachers may be found in Table 2. Seventy per cent of the respondents had less than five years of experience in the laboratory nursery school while only eight per cent had 16 or more years of experience. This indicates that teaching in a laboratory was a relatively new experience for most of the supervising teachers.

The supervising teachers' responsibilities other than the supervision of student teachers in the laboratory

TABLE 1

The Educational Background of Supervising
Teachers Presented in Percentage

Major Field of Study	Degrees			Total
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctor's	
Administration		1		1
Childhood Education	11	51	1	63
Elementary Education	1	8		9
Higher Education		1		1
Home Economics	3	3		6
Home Economics Education	6	2		8
Psychology	1	7		8
Special Education		3		3
No Answer				1
Total	22	76	1	100

TABLE 2

Years Experience of the Supervising Teacher
in the Laboratory Nursery School

Years of Experience in the Laboratory Nursery School	Per Cent
1 - 5	70
6 - 10	12
11 - 15	10
16 +	8
Total	100

program are listed in Table 3. It must be noted that teachers responding could check more than one responsibility.

Ninety-eight per cent of the supervising teachers reported that they had teaching responsibilities other than supervising in the laboratory school. The additional responsibility in which most (82%) of the supervising teachers were involved was teaching undergraduates. Seventy-seven per cent reported that they were committee members, and 45 per cent were involved in research. Advising undergraduate and graduate students was a responsibility of 61 per cent of the supervising teachers. Only two per cent of the supervising teachers had administrative duties.

TABLE 3

Supervising Teachers' Responsibilities Other
than the Laboratory Nursery School

(N = 100)

Responsibility	%
Teach Undergraduates	82
Teach Graduates	14
Teach Extension Courses	2
Teach High School	0
Personal Research	18
Departmental Research	12
Student Research	15
Advise Master's Theses	11
Advise Dissertations	2
Advise Undergraduate Majors	48
Home Economics Committee Member	33
University or College Committee Member	44
Administrative Duties	2
No Responsibility Other Than Supervising	2

Description of the Various Types of Groups
of Children in the Nursery
School Programs

The ages of children in the laboratory programs and the groups with which the student teachers participate are presented in Table 4.

The ages of children in most of the nursery school programs were three and four years old. One hundred per cent of the respondents participating in the study reported programs for four-year-old children and involved student teachers in the program. Also, 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that they included student teacher participation with three-year-old children. Of the 25 per cent of the respondents who indicated progress for five-year-old children, all of the 25 per cent also involved the student teachers with that age group.

Twenty-one per cent of the respondents indicated involvement of the student teachers in programs for socially and economically deprived children. Twenty-five per cent of the respondents reported involvement of the student teachers in programs for culturally deprived children. Some of the respondents indicated involvement of the student teachers with groups of children which were not included in the table, such as infants. One per cent of the respondents involved the student teachers in programs for infants, one per cent in programs for Oriental children, and one per cent in programs for migrant children.

TABLE 4

The Types of Children in the 100 Laboratory Programs
and the Percentage of Groups in Which
the Student Teachers Participate

Groups of Children	Percentage of Groups Included in Laboratory Program	Percentage of Groups in which Student Teachers Participate
Toddlers	10	6
Two Year Olds	15	6
Three Year Olds	90	90
Four Year Olds	100	100
Five Year Olds	25	25
Culturally Deprived	21	25*
Emotionally Disturbed	11	11
Mentally Retarded	16	16
Socially and Economically Deprived	20	21*
Special Education	13	18*
Church School	5	8*

*The larger percentage of groups in which student teachers participate in comparison to the groups of children included in the laboratory program is due to the participation of the student teachers in child care programs in the community. Some universities and colleges included this experience in the student teaching curriculum so that student teachers received child care teaching experience not included in the laboratory program.

Description of Length of Time of Operation
of the Nursery Schools

A description of the laboratory programs in terms of the hours per day and the days per week of operation is presented in the terms of percentages in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Number of Hours per Day and Days per Week
the Laboratory Schools Operate

Hours per Day School Operates	Per Cent	Number of Days per Week					Total
		1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	5 %	
1 - 4	91	1	2	24	64		91
5 - 8	9					9	9
Total							100

Of the 100 respondents, 91 per cent reported that the laboratory schools operated between one and four hours per day and of these, 64 per cent reported that schools operated five days a week and 27 per cent reported that schools operated less than five days per week. Only nine per cent of the respondents indicated that the laboratory schools operated from five to eight hours per day for five days per week.

Description of Student Teacher Participation
in the Nursery Schools

The present and maximum number of student teachers participating in the laboratory programs are presented in Table 6 in terms of percentages.

TABLE 6

Present and Maximum Number of Student Teachers
Participating in Laboratory Programs

Number of Student Teachers	Per Cent of Programs Presently Having Number Range	Per Cent of Programs Reporting Maximum Number Range
1 - 10	49	33
11 - 20	33	38
21 - 30	10	21
31 - 40	4	2
41 - 50	2	3
51 - 60		
61 +	2	3
Total	100	100

Forty-nine per cent of the responding teachers indicated that the laboratory programs presently enrolled between one and ten student teachers, and 33 per cent indicated that the maximum number of students that could be

enrolled was between one and ten. Only three per cent of the respondents indicated that the programs could enroll a maximum of more than 61 student teachers.

The class levels of students participating as teachers in the laboratory programs are presented in Table 7 in terms of percentages as indicated by the responding supervising teachers.

TABLE 7

Class Levels of Student Teachers Participating
in the Laboratory Programs

Class Levels of Students	Per Cent of Laboratory Programs
Sophomore	9
Junior	42
Senior	49
Total	100

Nearly all of the student teachers are either juniors or seniors. Forty-nine per cent of the responding teachers indicated that seniors were enrolled as student teachers in their laboratory programs. Forty-two per cent of the responding teachers indicated that juniors were enrolled as students, and nine per cent indicated that sophomores were enrolled as students in the programs.

The number of contact hours that the student teachers have with the children each week is presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Number of Weekly Contact Hours Student Teachers
Have with the Children (N = 100)

Number of Hours per Week	Per Cent of Programs
1 - 5	36
6 - 10	49
11 - 15	9
16 - 20	6
Total	100

Thirty-six per cent of the respondents reported that student teachers were expected to participate with the children between one and five hours per week. Forty-nine per cent of the respondents reported that student teachers were expected to participate between six and ten hours per week.

Eighty-five per cent of the supervising teachers expected student teachers to serve less than three weeks as lead teachers in the laboratory situation, while the remaining 15 per cent expected students to serve as lead teachers for three to six weeks. Ninety-two per cent of the supervising teachers required the selection of a specific theme

to be emphasized by the student teacher during the week or weeks as lead teacher. Ninety-five per cent of the respondents indicated that the student teachers are taught under constant supervision.

Credit Hours for Student Teaching

The description of the student teaching programs in terms of semesters required and credit hours earned was also reported by the respondents. Forty-three per cent of the respondents indicated that one full semester of student teaching was required to earn a degree in their programs, 30 per cent indicated two semesters were required, 26 per cent indicated one quarter was required, and one per cent indicated that four semesters or two academic years of student teaching were required to earn a degree.

Fifty per cent of the respondents indicated that six hours of credit were earned for student teaching in the laboratory programs. Thirty-four per cent of the respondents reported three hours of credit or less were earned for the course, while 16 per cent reported seven or more hours of credit were given for the course.

Number of Employees and Their Time Involved in Nursery Schools

The paid staff members employed in the laboratory programs are described and the percentage of programs having a specific number of staff members are presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Paid Staff Members Employed in
the Laboratory Schools

Staff Members	Percentage of Schools Having a Specific Number of Staff Members							Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Full-timed Trained Teachers		53	28	9	5		5	100
Part-time Trained Teachers	72	15	6	5		2		100
Cook	58	40	2					100
Janitor and/or Maid		90	10					100
Reader-aides	99	1						100
Medical Personnel	91	9						100
Secretaries	99	1						100
Research Assistants	99	1						100
Supervisor	98	2						100

All of the laboratory schools had full-time trained teachers. Twenty-eight per cent had part-time trained teachers, 42 per cent had cooks, nine per cent had medical personnel, and all of the schools had janitors or maids.

The number of hours per week that the paid staff members participated in the laboratory schools is presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

Number of Hours per Week Staff Members Participated
in the Laboratory Schools

Staff Members	Range of Hours of Participation by Percentage						Total
	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41+	
Full-time Trained Teachers		9	57	9	20	5	100
Part-time Trained Teachers	72	10	15	2	1		100
Cook	58	2	15	12	13		100
Janitor and/or Maid		65	9	5	20	1	100
Reader-aides	99				1		100
Medical Personnel	91	8			1		100
Secretaries	99	1					100
Research Assistants	99		1				100
Supervisor	98	2					100

Fifty-seven per cent of the responding teachers indicated that the full-time trained teachers in the laboratory programs participated from 11 to 20 hours per week. Sixty-five per cent of the respondents reported that the janitors or maids worked one to 10 hours per week.

Tasks of Student Teachers
in Nursery Schools

In order to complete the checklist, the respondent had to be a supervising teacher in a laboratory nursery school in a university or college. Some laboratory schools had more than one supervising teacher, in which case each of the supervising teachers were asked to participate by filling in a questionnaire and checklist. From the 60 laboratory schools included in this study, 100 supervising teachers responded.

The task checklist was devised so that the supervising teachers could indicate the current practice and extent of involvement of the student teachers in 102 tasks required or expected of them in the laboratory experience. The tasks were categorized into the following seven areas: (A) Creative activity or experience; (B) Food service; (C) Care and cleaning of equipment and supplies; (D) Planning; (E) Supervision; (F) Teaching techniques; and (G) Evaluation. The amount of involvement of the student teachers in these tasks was described in five columns in which the supervising teachers could indicate the practices they followed in involving the student teachers in each specific task. These five columns were (1) Required of all student teachers all of the time; (2) Engaged in by the student teacher upon the supervising teacher's request; (3) Engaged in by the student teacher upon the student teacher's request; (4) Never

experienced; (5) Does not apply.

Columns One, Two and Three were added to gain a positive response. Columns Four and Five were added to gain a negative response. A sixth column was added in analyzing the data to account for respondents who did not check a task experience. The response to all tasks were tabulated and are presented in percentages according to the seven areas of task experiences in tabular form.

Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Creative Activity or Experience

The responses of the 100 supervising teachers to the tasks in the area creative activity or experience are presented in Table 11.

Over 50 per cent of the responding teachers indicated that they do not require or expect student teachers to have experience in tasks related to parent education. These tasks were the following: arrange a parents' shelf of literature on child development or child rearing; write articles for the nursery school bulletin; participate in a parent conference; attend a parents' meeting; and, make home visits to one or more nursery school children. Fifty-six per cent of the supervising teachers required student teachers to create a teaching aid while only 29 per cent of the respondents indicated that the students created an aid as a result of individual need or desire. Eighty-eight per

TABLE 11

Creative Activity or Experience Required
or Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
1. Arrange bulletin board as a special learning activity for the children	52	18	22	1	6	1
2. Arrange bulletin board using the children's art work and pictures	28	39	28	4	1	1
3. Arrange a parent's shelf of literature on child development or child rearing	10	16	9	28	36	1
4. Write articles for the nursery school bulletin	9	8	6	21	55	1
5. Write progress report of the children	54	19	4	16	7	0
6. Participate in a parent conference	23	18	12	44	2	1
7. Observe a parent conference	17	18	18	39	7	1
8. Attend a parent's meeting--includes the nursery school staff and parents of the nursery school children	17	18	18	39	7	1
9. Attend professional conferences with the supervising teacher	24	34	24	11	6	1
10. Make home visits to one or more nursery school children	33	13	13	18	23	0
11. Fulfill reading requirements of the student teacher curriculum	80	7	1	1	11	1
12. Create a teaching aid	51	14	15	6	7	2

cent of the supervising teachers either required or expected the students to read in the area of the preschool curriculum. In 82 per cent of the laboratory programs, the teachers required or expected the student teachers to attend professional conferences. The arrangement of the bulletin boards as a special learning activity for the children was also experienced by the student teachers in the laboratory programs of 92 per cent of the respondents.

Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Food Service

The task requirements or expectations in the area of food service are presented in Table 12.

Over 60 per cent of the responding teachers indicated that the student teachers in the programs did not receive experience in the planning or preparation of a meal. The tasks that show such an indication are the following: help in setting the tables for lunch; help in the service of lunch; and, help buy groceries. Many students graduating in preschool or early childhood education take positions in day care centers which require a knowledge of the responsibilities involved in the preparation of meals, yet 60 per cent of the students are not trained for such a task. In the last question of the checklist, ten per cent of the supervising teachers listed this experience as one that was desired or needed in their laboratory programs. Eighty-one

TABLE 12
Food Service Experience Required or
Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1. Sponge the tables in preparation for juice or snack	61	17	4	10	8	1
2. Help in the preparation of juice or snack	66	14	2	7	11	0
3. Help in setting the tables for lunch	23	10	2	12	47	1
4. Help in the service of lunch	27	9	4	7	52	1
5. Eat at the tables with the children as teacher	72	6	3	2	16	1
6. Help buy groceries	3	8	7	30	52	1

per cent of the teachers expected the student teachers to eat at the tables with the children and 82 per cent expected the student teachers to help in the preparation of juice or snack.

Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Care and Cleaning of Equipment and Supplies

The responses in the area of care and cleaning of equipment and supplies are presented in Table 13.

The data revealed that more than 84 per cent of the responding teachers expected the student teachers to be

TABLE 13

Care and Cleaning of Equipment and Supplies
Experience Required or Expected
of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1. Fill containers for water play activity	67	17	7	2	6	1
2. Sponge the table after water play	70	17	8	0	5	0
3. Mop water from the floor after water play	67	18	8	1	6	0
4. Place wet towels or rag rugs in suitable place for drying	69	16	6	1	8	0
5. Clean housekeeping area	70	14	7	2	7	0
6. Put away dress-up clothes after use	78	14	5	1	1	1
7. Clean the lavatories and/or sinks at the end of the day	23	9	4	40	24	0
8. Clean lockers	12	30	4	29	23	1
9. Take cots or mats from storage areas to usual resting place and return	19	5	1	12	62	1
10. Water indoor plants	25	38	14	9	14	0
11. Feed and water pets	25	46	14	5	8	2
12. Clean block and toy storage shelves	41	24	4	16	11	1
13. Care for books	55	28	7	6	4	0
14. Care for the yard	30	13	3	18	35	1
15. Get tricycles and wheel toys from storage area and return them after use	70	11	7	5	6	1

TABLE 13 (continued)

Care and Cleaning of Equipment and Supplies
Experience Required or Expected
of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all	%	%	%	%	%
16. Oil tricycles and wagons	4	21	5	48	20	2
17. Sweep sidewalk and wheel toy area	6	15	6	33	49	1
18. Clear sidewalks of snow and ice	1	5	2	33	58	1
19. Get sand toys from storage area and return them after use	63	17	9	6	5	0
20. Get out and put away woodworking materials	62	19	10	5	3	1
21. Arrange doll corner or housekeeping area	70	17	9	2	2	0
22. Mix play dough	65	22	9	2	2	0
23. Mix tempera paints	72	16	7	1	4	0
24. Prepare soap paint using egg beaters	58	22	12	1	1	1
25. Prepare art area for easel painting	77	13	8	1	1	0
26. Mix natural clay and store for future use	34	39	9	10	8	1
27. Prepare art area for finger painting	76	11	12	0	1	0
28. Prepare art area for coloring, pasting	80	12	8	0	0	0
29. Clean art area after activity	82	11	6	1	0	0

involved in 22 of the 29 tasks related to maintenance duties such as care and cleaning of equipment and supplies. Some of these maintenance tasks include: fill containers for water play activity, sponge the table after water play, clean housekeeping area, clean block and toy storage shelves. The seven tasks which received 50 per cent or more of the responses of the teachers as never experienced or not applicable to the student teachers in the programs were the following: clean the lavatories and/or sinks at the end of the day; clean lockers; take cots or mats from the storage area to usual resting place and return them after rests; care for the yard; oil tricycles and wagons; sweep sidewalk of snow and ice. The responses to task, take cots or mats from the storage areas to usual resting place and return them after rest, indicated that 62 per cent of the teachers felt that did not apply to their programs. Such a response might mean that rest pads were used rather than cots or mats, or that rest periods were not experienced in the laboratory programs.

The emphasis, however, in expecting the student teachers to perform these tasks seem to be upon the objective of setting the example for the children and helping the children to learn to aid in the clean-up experience. This emphasis is indicated by the higher percentages of responses in the area of Supervision and Teaching techniques as compared with the responses in the area of Care and cleaning of

equipment and supplies.

Responses to the Checklist in
the Area of Planning

The responses to the tasks involving the planning of activities in the laboratory program as presented in Area can be found in Table 14.

Over 50 per cent of the respondents indicated that the student teachers received no experience with parent education activities or these activities did not apply to the program. This percentage corresponds to the figure in the area of creative experience and activity. In the area of Planning, the two tasks related to the parent education experience are the following: be responsible for the planning and distribution of the nursery school bulletin and plan a parent conference.

Ninety-nine per cent of the respondents indicated that the student teachers were either required or expected to plan for transition periods in the changing of activities in the day's schedule. The responses to the task of planning rest time, revealed that this experience did not apply in 30 per cent of the laboratory programs. The task in which the student teachers prepare the cots or mats for rest also received a high percentage (62%) in the "does not apply" column. This indicates that some laboratory programs are not including a "rest time" experience in their schedules or rest mats or pads are not used. Ninety-four per cent of the

TABLE 14
Planning Experience Required or
Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1. Be responsible for the planning and distribution of the nursery school bulletin	10	9	2	16	62	1
2. Plan a parent conference	19	13	10	43	15	1
3. Plan a children's library, bookshelf or rack	52	19	8	14	7	0
4. Plan table and area for water play activity	64	17	14	2	2	1
5. Plan arrangement of outdoor play equipment	63	18	6	8	5	0
6. Plan arrangement of table for manipulative toys	75	13	8	1	2	1
7. Plan a field trip or excursion	66	11	16	3	4	0
8. Plan a daily schedule	79	8	7	4	2	0
9. Plan a source file	51	10	12	13	14	0
10. Plan a resource unit	55	9	6	17	12	1
11. Plan a weekly schedule	70	7	8	10	5	0
12. Plan a monthly schedule	24	8	6	38	23	1
13. Plan a curriculum guide	21	6	6	44	23	1
14. Plan a music experience	80	10	10	1	0	0
15. Plan a creative dramatics experience	67	14	19	1	1	0
16. Plan a nature or science center	70	13	17	1	2	0

TABLE 14 (continued)

Planning Experience Required or
Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
17. Plan a main center of interest for the room	60	21	19	3	3	2
18. Plan for transition periods in the changing of activities	83	8	8	0	1	0
19. Plan rest time	52	10	3	5	30	0

teachers required or expected the students to plan a daily schedule; 85 per cent required or expected the students to plan a weekly schedule; and, 38 per cent required or expected the students to plan a monthly schedule. Student teachers in the programs of 27 per cent of the respondents did not have experience in planning a source file. Since a source file is a useful reference when the student graduates and assumes a position, the data reveals that too few programs require a source file.

Over 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that they required or expected the students to plan for specific activities which were listed in seven of the tasks. These seven activities or tasks were the following: plan table and area for water play activity; plan arrangement of table

for manipulative toys; plan a field trip or excursion; plan a music experience; plan a creative dramatics experience; plan a nature or science center; and plan a main center of interest for the room.

Responses to the Checklist in the Area of Supervision

The responses in the area of supervision are presented in Table 15.

Half of the tasks in this area were required by 75 per cent or more of the respondents. As in the area of planning, the tasks receiving a high percentage of response in the area of supervision were the creative experiences that were required of student teachers. These tasks were the following: conduct a "concept" learning experience; conduct an art experience; direct outdoor play; supervise a daily schedule; direct a science experience; supervise transition periods between activities; and supervise "free play time." Ninety-two per cent of the teachers required or expected the students to have experience in the supervision of a field trip or excursion. Ninety-nine per cent of the teachers required or expected the students to have experience supervision a music experience. Fifty-six per cent of the teachers indicated that the students did not receive experience in the supervision of the health check of the children while 39 per cent indicated this did not apply to the program.

TABLE 15

Supervision Experience Required or
Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1. Supervise health check in the morning	22	10	9	17	39	3
2. Supervise rest time	52	12	3	2	30	1
3. Supervise a music experience	79	10	10	0	1	0
4. Conduct a "concept learning" experience	83	4	12	0	1	0
5. Conduct an art experience	84	5	9	1	0	1
6. Direct outdoor play	88	7	3	0	2	0
7. Supervise a field trip or excursion	62	15	15	4	3	1
8. Supervise a daily schedule	83	11	3	3	0	0
9. Supervise a weekly schedule	56	13	7	11	13	0
10. Supervise a monthly schedule	21	11	8	34	25	1
11. Direct a creative dramatics experience	57	14	23	3	3	0
12. Direct a science experience	73	8	16	1	1	1
13. Supervise transition periods between activities	85	7	4	1	2	1
14. Supervise the "free play" time	89	7	1	1	0	0

Responses to the Checklist in the
Area of Teaching Techniques

The responses to these tasks in the area of Teaching techniques are presented in Table 16.

Thirteen of the teaching techniques listed were required by 90 per cent or more of the supervising teachers. Six tasks which were not required by 90 per cent or more of the teachers were the following: aid an injured child; interrupt and direct a child's activity; use mild physical force; use strong physical force; set policies for the children; and sing to the child for comfort. Eighty-four per cent of the respondents indicated that they did not require or expect the students to use strong physical force. The use of strong physical force may have been interpreted to mean only spanking. Other methods, however, could have been used in expressing strong physical punishment (physical withdrawal of a child from a situation and isolation). The data revealed that supervising teachers expect the student teachers to use methods of disciplining young children other than strong physical force.

Responses to the Checklist in the
Area of Evaluation

The responses to the tasks in the area evaluation are presented in Table 17.

Forty-four per cent of the supervising teachers indicated that they required the students at the end of the day

TABLE 16

Teaching Techniques Required or
Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer					
	Not Apply					
Tasks	Never Experienced					
	Student Request					
Tasks	Supervisor Request					
	Required of all					
1. Aid an injured child	61	28	5	3	2	1
2. Enforce limits established by the nursery school staff	100	0	0	0	0	0
3. Explain rules and limits to the children	96	3	1	0	0	0
4. Redirect children's actions	96	3	1	0	0	0
5. Encourage children's actions	97	3	0	0	0	0
6. Offer alternatives when there is a choice of action	98	2	0	0	0	0
7. Initiate conversation between or from children	89	6	3	1	0	1
8. Interrupt and direct a child's activity	69	18	3	3	4	1
9. Anticipate problems and divert actions	94	4	2	0	0	0
10. Use mild physical force	46	18	7	19	16	1
11. Use strong physical force	6	5	1	54	30	4
12. Use positive redirection	96	4	0	0	0	0
13. Give reassurance, support, and comfort	98	2	0	0	0	0
14. Set policies for the children	49	24	6	13	7	0
15. Reinforce good behavior	92	4	0	0	4	0
16. State expectations in a positive way	97	3	0	0	0	0
17. Praise the child	94	4	1	0	1	0

TABLE 16 (continued)

Teaching Techniques Required or
Expected of Student Teachers

Tasks	No Answer						%
	Not Apply						%
	Never Experienced						%
	Student Request						%
	Supervisor Request						%
	Required of all						%
18. Sing to the child for comfort	93	10	29	11	6	1	
19. Redirect aggressive activity	94	3	3	0	0	0	

TABLE 17

Evaluation

Tasks	No Answer						%
	Not Apply						%
	Never Experienced						%
	Student Request						%
	Supervisor Request						%
	Required of all						%
1. At the end of day evaluate each child's behavior for anecdotal record	44	31	9	7	8	1	
2. Evaluate student participation experiences at the end of the day	70	17	8	1	4	0	
3. Evaluate own student teaching experience	89	7	3	1	0	0	

to evaluate each child's behavior for anecdotal records. Ninety-five per cent of the teachers required or expected, at the end of the day, the students to evaluate their participation experiences, and 99 per cent of the teachers required or expected the students to evaluate their own student teaching experience.

Responses to the Checklist Indicating Additional
Tasks Expected or Required by
Supervising Teachers

The final page of the checklist provided space for the supervising teachers to list additional tasks which were expected of student teachers in their current programs.

These are listed below:

1. Discuss and interpret children's behavior (6% response)
2. Plan weekly menus (5% response)
3. Write a case study of a child (3% response)
4. Assemble dress-up items and other articles for children's activities (7% response)
5. Delegate responsibilities to other students in the room (5% response)
6. Observe in other preschool settings (7% response)
7. Keep a teaching journal (1% response)
8. Create a statement of teaching philosophy (1% response)

Responses to the Checklist Indicating Additional Tasks Needed in the Laboratory Programs

The final page of the checklist also provided space for the supervising teachers to list tasks that they believed should be included in their present programs in training students in preschool education. These suggestions are listed below:

1. Visitation, observation and participation in the community child care programs (12% response)
2. Help plan nursery school budget (6% response)
3. Plan for visitors and observers in the laboratory program (4% response)
4. Use of all campus and community resources in the planning of activities for the children (4% response)
5. Plan menus and meals for the nursery school programs (10% response)

Summary and Interpretation of the Findings

The respondents in this study were 100 teachers supervising student teachers in nursery school programs in 60 colleges and universities in the United States. Since some colleges and universities had more than one supervising teacher in the laboratory nursery school, the number of respondents is larger than the number of colleges or universities. The survey instrument used in this study consisted

of a questionnaire and a checklist, and both were to be completed by the supervising teachers. The questionnaire provided information relative to the fourth purpose of this study which was to describe and to compare the laboratory programs. This information described the supervising teachers in the laboratory nursery school programs including their experience and education, the student teacher enrollment, hours that students participated in the program, and the types of groups of children enrolled in the programs.

A summary of the data from the questionnaires revealed that the supervising teachers in the laboratory programs were academically trained for the positions they held. Seventy-six per cent of the supervising teachers held master's degrees and 22 per cent held bachelor's degrees. However, teaching in a laboratory nursery school program was a relatively new experience for most of the supervising teachers as indicated by the data. Seventy per cent had less than five years of experience in the laboratory school.

Forty-nine per cent of the teachers indicated that seniors were enrolled as student teachers in their laboratory programs, 42 per cent indicated that juniors were enrolled as student teachers, and nine per cent indicated that sophomores were enrolled in the programs. The data revealed that there was a wide variation in the number of hours that the students spent participating in the laboratory. Thirty-six per cent of the teachers reported that the

student teachers were expected to participate with the children for five or less hours per week. Forty-nine per cent of the teachers reported that students were expected to participate for six to ten hours per week.

There is a lack of consistency in the number of hours credit given for student teaching. Six credit hours were given for the course in student teaching in the laboratory programs of 50 per cent of the respondents. Thirty-four per cent of the teachers reported three hours of credit or less were given for the course.

The data revealed that most programs were for three and four-year old children, but most student teachers lack a broad experience with the socially, culturally, economically, and mentally deprived children. One hundred per cent of the respondents reported programs for four-year-old children which involved student teachers. Ninety per cent of the respondents indicated programs for student teacher participation with three-year-old children, while only 25 per cent indicated programs for student teacher participation with five-year-old children. Twenty-one per cent of the respondents indicated involvement of the students in programs for socially and economically deprived children; 25 per cent indicated involvement of the students in programs for the culturally deprived children; and, 16 per cent indicated involvement of the student teachers in programs for the mentally retarded children.

The checklist identified tasks required or expected of student teachers in the laboratory programs. Additional tasks to those listed on the checklist were reported by the supervising teachers on the final page of the checklist.

The responses of the 100 supervising teachers to the checklists of tasks required or expected of student teachers in the laboratory program revealed some interesting findings. Responses to the tasks related to parent education indicated that 50 per cent or more of the teachers do not expect the students to have experience in these tasks. In 82 per cent of the laboratory programs, the teachers required or expected the students to attend professional conferences.

Over 60 per cent of the responding teachers indicated that the student teachers in the programs did not receive experience in the planning or preparation of a meal. Ten per cent of the teachers listed this experience in the last question of the checklist as one that was desired or needed in their laboratory programs.

The data revealed that 84 per cent or more of the responding teachers expected the students to be involved in 22 of the 29 tasks related to maintenance duties such as care and cleaning of equipment and supplies. The emphasis, however, in expecting the student teachers to perform these tasks seemed to be upon the objective of setting the example for the children and helping the children to learn to aid

the teachers in the clean-up experience. This emphasis is indicated by the higher percentage of responses that expect or require the students to perform tasks in the areas of (E) Supervision and (F) Teaching techniques as compared with the responses in area (C) Care and cleaning of equipment and supplies.

Planning for transition periods was emphasized by the respondents as an experience that the students received. Ninety-nine per cent of the respondents expected the students to plan for transition periods. Planning for rest time was not an experience that applied to 33 per cent of the laboratory programs according to the responding teachers. This indicates that some laboratory programs do not include a "rest time" in their schedule. Most of the teachers, however, did indicate that the students received experience in the planning of creative activities for the children.

As in tasks related to the planning of activities in the program, the tasks related to supervision, which received the highest percentage of responses, were in the creative activities for the children. Fifty-six per cent of the responses indicated that students received no experience in supervising the health check of the children.

The area of teaching techniques received the highest percentage of responses, indicating that these techniques were required of students in most of the laboratory programs.

The technique receiving the least number of responses was the use of strong physical force. This might indicate that the supervising teachers expected the students to learn other methods of disciplining young children.

Tasks related to evaluation of the student teaching experience by the students and evaluation of the children's behavior received high percentages of the responses. Personal Evaluation by the student of the teaching experiences were thus emphasized. Additional tasks listed by the teachers as needed in the programs reflected the findings which indicated that some tasks were not included in the student teaching experience.

Additional tasks which were required or expected of student teachers by the supervising teachers in their current programs were the following: discuss and interpret children's behavior, plan weekly menus, observe in other preschool settings, create a teaching philosophy, write a case study of a child, assemble dress-up and other articles for children's activities, delegate responsibilities to other students in the room, and keep a teaching journal.

Additional tasks which the supervising teachers believed should be included in their present programs were also listed: visit, observe, and participate in community child care programs; help plan nursery school budget, plan for visitors and observers in the laboratory program, use all campus and community resources in the planning of

activities for the children, plan menus and meals for the nursery school program.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purposes of this study were the following: (1) to identify the tasks and experiences required or expected of child development majors during their period of student teaching in a university or college laboratory nursery school; (2) to identify additional tasks and experiences required or expected by the supervising teachers in the training provided student teachers; (3) to determine additional tasks and experiences that each supervising teacher believes should be included in the student teaching requirements; and, (4) to describe and compare the various laboratory nursery school programs offering preschool student teacher preparation in universities and colleges.

Introductory letters describing the study were mailed to the directors of the laboratory nursery school programs in 190 universities and colleges offering majors in child development. The names of these institutions were obtained from the Directory of Land-Grant Universities (1968) and the College Blue Book (1969). The directors were asked to indicate on postal cards whether or not they were willing to distribute the instruments to the supervising teachers in their programs. Of the 190 directors who were mailed the

letters, 84 (44%) responded in the affirmative and requested 195 task checklists, 23 (12%) indicated at the present time they did not operate a laboratory program, eleven (6%) indicated that they would not be able to participate, and 72 (38%) did not respond. It must be noted, however, that shortly after the letters were mailed, a mail strike took place, and conceivably some directors may not have received the letters.

The instrument used in this survey included a questionnaire and a task checklist. Both were completed by the supervising teachers. The questionnaire provided information relative to the fourth purpose of this study which was to describe and to compare the laboratory programs. This information provided a description of supervising teachers roles in the laboratory nursery school programs. It also included their experience and education, the number of student teachers enrolled during a semester, the hours that student teachers participated in the programs, and the types of groups of children enrolled in the programs. The checklist of tasks requested information relative to the first three purposes of this study. The checklist identified tasks required or expected of student teachers in the laboratory programs. In the space provided, additional tasks to those listed on the checklist were reported by the supervising teachers.

One hundred and ninety-five questionnaires and

checklists were mailed to the supervising teachers in the 84 schools in which the directors indicated a willingness to participate in the study. One hundred (51%) of the supervising teachers responded by filling in the questionnaire and checklist and returning them to the investigator. These 100 teachers represented nursery school programs in 60 colleges and universities in the United States. Since some colleges and universities had more than one supervising teacher in the laboratory nursery school, the number of respondents was greater than the numbers of institutions.

Summary of Major Findings from the Questionnaire

An analysis of the data from the 100 questionnaires returned by the supervising teachers provided information which could be used in describing and comparing the various laboratory nursery school programs offering preschool teacher preparation in universities and colleges. The data were tabulated and presented by percentages in tabular form.

There was evidence that the supervising teachers in the laboratory programs were academically trained for the positions they held. Seventy-six per cent of the responding teachers held master's degrees. Fifty-one per cent had master's degrees in childhood education. Twenty-two per cent of the respondents held bachelors degrees, and only one laboratory teacher had an earned doctor's degree.

Teaching in a laboratory nursery school program was a

relatively new experience for most of the supervising teachers. A majority, 70 per cent, of the responding teachers had less than five years of experience in the laboratory nursery school. Only eight per cent had 16 or more years of experience. Interestingly enough two of the eight were on the same nursery school staff.

All of the respondents, 100 per cent, reported programs for four-year-old children which involved student teachers. Also, 90 per cent of the respondents indicated programs for student teacher participation with three-year-old children, while 25 per cent indicated programs for student teacher participation with five-year-old children.

Less than 25 per cent of the respondents indicated that student teachers had experience working with socially, culturally, economically, and mentally deprived children. Twenty-one per cent of the respondents indicated involvement of the student teachers in programs for socially and economically deprived children; 25 per cent indicated involvement of the students in programs for the culturally deprived children; and, 16 per cent indicated involvement of the student teachers in programs for the mentally retarded children.

Forty-nine per cent of the responding teachers indicated that seniors were enrolled as student teachers in their laboratory programs. Forty-two per cent indicated that juniors were enrolled as students, and nine per cent indicated that sophomores were enrolled in the programs.

There is a wide variation in the number of hours that the student teachers spend participating in the laboratory. Thirty-six per cent of the teachers reported that the student teachers were expected to participate with the children for five or less hours per week. Forty-nine per cent of the teachers reported that students were expected to participate for six to ten hours per week.

There is a lack of consistency in the number of hours credit given for student teaching and the number of semesters required. Six credit hours were given for the course in student teaching in the laboratory programs of 50 per cent of the respondents. Thirty-four per cent of the respondents reported three hours of credit or less were given for the course. Forty-three per cent of the respondents indicated that one semester of student teaching was required to earn a degree in their programs, 30 per cent indicated two semesters were required, and one per cent indicated that four semesters of student teaching were required for a degree.

Summary of Major Findings from the Checklist

The responses to the 100 checklists, tasks expected or required of student teachers in laboratory programs revealed that the students are given varied experiences in assuming responsibilities for the 102 tasks which were divided into seven areas of classification. Additional

tasks which were required or expected by the supervising teachers in their current programs were listed, and additional tasks which the supervising teachers believed should be included in their present programs were also listed.

In the task area of creative activity or experience, 50 per cent of the supervising teachers indicated that they do not require or expect student teachers to have experience in tasks related to parent education. Some of these tasks include the following: arrangement of a parents' shelf of literature on child development or child rearing, writing articles for the nursery school bulletin, and participation in a parent conference.

In the task area of food service, over 60 per cent of the responding teachers indicated that the student teachers in the programs did not receive experience in the planning or preparation of a meal. The tasks that involved meal preparation were the following: helping in setting the tables for lunch, helping in the service of lunch, and helping buy groceries. Meals may not be served at all in 50 per cent or more of the laboratory programs because of the indication by 50 per cent or more of the respondents that tasks related to meal preparation did not apply to their program.

In the task area of care and cleaning of equipment and supplies, the data revealed that 84 per cent or more of the responding teachers expected the student teachers to be involved in 22 of the 29 tasks related to maintenance

duties. Some of these duties include: fill containers for water play activity, sponge the table after water play, clean block and storage shelves. The objective in expecting the student teachers to perform these tasks was to set the example for the children and to help the children learn to aid in the clean-up experience. This emphasis was indicated by the higher percentages of responses in the task areas of Supervision and Teaching Techniques as compared with the responses in the area of Care and Cleaning of equipment and supplies.

In the task area of planning, over 50 per cent of the teachers indicated that students received no experience in tasks related to planning in parent education. Ninety-nine per cent of the respondents indicated that the students were either required or expected to plan for transition periods in the changing of activities in the day's schedule. The responses to the task of planning for rest time revealed that this experience did not apply to 30 per cent of the laboratory programs. Ninety-four per cent of the teachers required or expected the students to plan daily schedules, 85 per cent required or expected the students to plan weekly schedules, and 38 per cent required or expected the students to plan monthly schedules. Students in the programs of 27 per cent of the respondents did not have experience in planning a source file.

In the task area of supervision, half of the 14 tasks

in this area were required by 75 per cent or more of the respondents. The tasks receiving high percentages of response were related to supervision of creative activities. Some of these creative experiences requiring supervision by the students were the following: conduct an art experience, direct a science experience. Fifty-six per cent of the teachers indicated that the students did not receive experience in the supervision of the health check of the children (39% indicated this task did not apply to their programs).

In the task area of teaching techniques, 13 of the 19 teaching techniques listed were required by 90 per cent or more of the supervising teachers. Six techniques which were not required by 90 per cent or more of the teachers were the following: aid an injured child, interrupt and direct a child's activity, use mild physical force, use strong physical force, set policies for the children, sing to the child for comfort. Eighty-four per cent of the teachers indicated that they did not require or expect the students to use strong physical force with a child. Supervising teachers expected the students to learn to use methods of disciplining young children other than strong physical force.

In the task area of evaluation, 44 per cent of the teachers indicated that they required the students at the end of the day to evaluate each child's behavior for anecdotal record. Ninety-four per cent of the teachers

required or expected the students to evaluate student participation experiences at the end of the day, and 99 per cent of the teachers required or expected the students to evaluate their own student teaching experience.

Additional tasks were required or expected of student teachers by the supervising teachers in some current programs. These tasks included: discuss and interpret children's behavior, plan weekly menus, observe in other preschool settings, create a teaching philosophy, write a case study of a child, assemble dress-up and other articles for children's activities, delegate responsibilities to other students in the room, and keep a teaching journal.

Supervising teachers believed that some additional tasks should be included in their present programs. Some of these were the following: visit, observe, and participate in community child care programs; help plan nursery school budget; plan for visitors and observers in the laboratory program; use all campus and community resources in the planning of activities for the children; and plan menus and meals for the nursery school program.

Implications for Supervising Teachers

The findings from this study could have implications for supervising teachers in laboratory nursery schools in colleges and universities so that the student teachers will be better trained for handling the jobs they will take. It

would appear from the findings that several areas of experience should be included in the students' training while doing supervised student teaching.

Student teachers should have more experience in the laboratory programs in working with children which are socially, culturally, economically, and mentally deprived. This type of training would more adequately prepare the future preschool teacher to cope with a variety of teaching problems and situations.

The value of in-service training of preschool teachers in the university or college laboratory nursery school needs to be emphasized. Training in such institutions could be more standardized so that teachers would have adequate teaching certification in all areas of experience and in all states.

Student teachers need more experience in the nursery school laboratory in the use of a variety of teaching techniques. Positive methods of disciplining young children should be emphasized as the teacher in the preschool situation sets the example for techniques of parental discipline.

Student teachers should be given the opportunity to evaluate their own teaching experience in the laboratory program. If this is accomplished in cooperation with the supervising teacher in a constructive manner, it could prove to be a most advantageous experience.

Re-evaluation of the student teaching programs in

preschool education is constantly needed. Additional tasks could be expected of the student teachers to more adequately prepare them to accept the responsibilities and duties of a future position.

Since parents are an integral part of the nursery school program, students should have experiences in developing techniques of working with parents as well as providing parents with information. This could be accomplished through a bulletin, conference, home visit, and progress report. Parents should be invited to observe and participate in the program so that the teacher can interpret children's behavior to them.

Student teachers may, after graduation, go to work in a program which includes meals, rest or nap time, and health check. These are routines which can be upsetting experiences for new, inexperienced teachers who have no training in what procedure to follow. It would then appear that in order to have adequate training for the various jobs one could take, these procedures should be included in the laboratory nursery school experience in the student teaching course in the colleges and universities.

Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendations concerning the training of students in preschool education that have resulted from the present study are the following:

An investigation could be made concerning the involvement of student teachers in a parent education program.

This would provide information describing the benefits of such a program to the student teacher's understanding of child behavior in relation to the parents.

A comparison should be made of the tasks performed by teachers in various non-laboratory nursery schools and the tasks performed by student teachers in the laboratory programs. Many of the graduates of teacher training institutions take positions in non-laboratory schools as child care centers and such a comparison could reveal information describing the adequacy of their training.

Re-evaluation of the certification requirements of teachers in child development or early childhood education should be made. College and university laboratory programs should review the training experiences offered student teachers in preschool education to insure adequacy of training in such areas as curriculum planning, parent education, meal planning, budgeting, selection and purchasing of equipment and supplies, and supervision of health check of the children.

Tasks performed and techniques used by student teachers working with different types and age groups of children could be compared (toddlers, two-year-olds, three-year-olds, four-year-olds, culturally deprived, emotionally disturbed, mentally retarded, socially and economically

deprived, special education, church school). The purpose of such a study would be to discover the various teaching techniques and amounts of supervision required in each situation.

Conclusion

As preschool education increasingly becomes an area of emphasis in the educational and social fields, the adequacy of training of teachers of young children must also be a concern. The training of preschool teachers could best be standardized, planned, and co-ordinated through the college or university laboratory nursery school programs which provide opportunities for observation and participation of young children under the direction of qualified supervising teachers.

It is hoped that the findings of this study will offer some insight into the quality and type of preparation that student teachers in preschool education receive in the laboratory nursery school programs in colleges and universities. The data revealed that some laboratory programs provide more opportunities for students to be involved in tasks which prepare them for a future preschool position than other laboratory programs. All laboratory programs do not include groups of children of different ages and which are culturally, socially, economically, and mentally deprived.

The resulting lack of consistency between nursery

school laboratory programs and the preparation given student teachers in these programs must be a concern in preschool education. The advances made in research, theory, and principles of early education need adequate application. The training of qualified teachers to fulfill this need is the responsibility and challenge of the nursery school laboratory programs in colleges and universities. Such a responsibility should not be neglected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

and Teacher Education Committee. Standards for teachers in
early childhood education. *Childhood Education*, 1955.
1956.

1. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

2. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

3. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

4. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

5. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

6. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

7. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

8. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

9. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

10. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

11. The role of the teacher in the early childhood
education program. *Childhood Education*, 1955. 30-34.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACEI Teacher Education Committee. Standards for teachers in early childhood education. Childhood Education, 1958, 35, 65-66.
- Bell, C. G. Can the art of teaching be structured? Journal of Home Economics, 1970, 62, 34-39.
- Bliss, L. B. Certification of teachers in nursery schools and day care centers. Childhood Education, 1958, 34, 275-278.
- Christianson, H. M., Rogers, M. M., and Ludlum, B. A. The nursery school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- The college blue book. (Majors and Curricula Leading to Collegiate Degrees). (12th ed.) Vol. 2. Los Angeles, California: College Planning Programs Ltd., 1968.
- Colorado State Department of Education. Kindergarten guide-book. Denver: Office of Instructional Services, 1960.
- Cornick, J. G. Laboratory teacher's responses indicating opportunity provided for young children's involvement in specific tasks. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1968.
- Davis, M. D. and Hansen, R. Nursery schools: their development and current practices in the united states. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1933. Bulletin 9.
- Frank, L. K. Fundamental needs of the child, Mental Hygiene, 1938, 22, 353-379. City by N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1963, 816.
- Gage, N. L. (Ed.) Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1963.
- Gesell, A., et al. Infant and child in the culture of today: the guidance of development in home and nursery school. New York: Harper, 1943.
- Haskell, H. S. Teacher preparation. Childhood Education, 1966, 62, 400-405.

- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kingsley, M. Supervision of the student teacher. Childhood Education, 1966, 42, 401-407.
- Lambert, H. M. Early childhood education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961.
- Lamdreth, C. Education of the young child. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1942.
- Langdon, G. Similarities and differences in teaching in nursery school, kindergarten and first grade. New York: John Day Co., 1933.
- Leeper, S. H., Dales, R. J., Skipper, D. S., and Witherspoon, R. L. Good schools for young children. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1968.
- Lowe, A. Becoming a teacher. Childhood Education, 1967, 64, 239-244.
- Martin, C. The emotional, social, and psychological make-up of the teacher and its relationship to teaching. Childhood Education, 1967, 64, 235-238.
- Moustakas, C. E. and Berson, M. P. The young child in school. New York: Whiteside and William Morrow and Co., 1966.
- Nimnicht, G., McAfee, O., and Meier, J. Observation record of teacher tasks. Publication of LINC. (Learning Institute of North Carolina Child Development Training Center, Greensboro, N. C.). 1960.
- Parten, M. Surveys, polls, and samples: practical procedures. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. 82nd Annual Convention. Washington, D. C.: November 10-13, 1968.
- Read, K. H. The nursery school. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1966.
- Rockwell, R. E. and Bittner, M. L. Rating teachers and aides. Young Children, 1967, 22, 381-384.

- Rubow, C. L. The effectiveness of three training methods for teacher aides working in pre-school classrooms. DARCEE Papers and Reports (Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education, Nashville, Tenn.), 1968, 2, 1-11.
- Sell, E. Is nursery school preparation for elementary school teaching? Childhood Education, 1967, 42, 516.
- Sigel, I. E. How does a research point of view contribute to the nursery school teacher? Journal of Nursery Education, 1957, 13, 18-26.
- Spock, B. Common sense book of baby and child care. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1946.
- Stith, M. and Hoeflin, R. Preschool teacher certification. Journal of Home Economics, 1967, 59, 371.
- Thompson, G. G. The social and emotional development of preschool children under two types of education programs. Psychological Monographs, 1944, 56, 5, Whole No. 258.
- Witherspoon, R. L. Teacher, know thyself. Childhood Education, 1958, 35, 56-59.

APPENDIXES

The University of North Carolina

At Greensboro

School of Home Economics

January 22, 1970

Dear Nursery School Director:

I am a graduate assistant in the nursery school laboratory program in the area of Child Development and Family Relations in the School of Home Economics at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

As part of my Master of Science in Home Economics thesis I am conducting a study of supervising teachers in university and college laboratories. I would like to include your nursery school in this study. I would like to call on you to discuss the study and to identify the experiences and tasks expected and required of the supervising teachers. A stamped envelope will be provided for your response and results of the study will be available to all participants at the close of the study in the spring of 1970.

Would you please indicate your willingness to cooperate by completing and returning the enclosed postal card.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Wendy Lynda E. Hooton
Graduate Assistant

Dr. Helen Gentry
Associate Professor
Home Economics

enclosure

The University of North Carolina

At Greensboro

School of Home Economics

January 22, 1970

Dear Nursery School Director:

I am a graduate assistant in the nursery school laboratory program in the area of Child Development and Family Relations in the School of Home Economics at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

As part of my Master of Science in Home Economics thesis I am conducting a survey of supervising teachers in university and college laboratory programs providing training of teachers in preschool education. I would like to enlist the response of your staff to a checklist identifying experiences and tasks expected and/or required of the student teachers. A stamped envelope will be provided for your response and results of the study will be available to all respondents at the close of the study in the spring of 1970.

Would you please indicate your willingness to cooperate by completing and returning the enclosed postal card.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Miss Lynda K. Weant
Graduate Assistant

Dr. Helen Canaday
Associate Professor
Home Economics

enclosure

POSTAL CARD INFORMATION

The information on the postal card sent to the laboratory nursery schools directors was the following:

Name _____

University _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

() I am willing or have my staff to cooperate in the survey by completing a checklist of books expected and/or required of student _____

APPENDIX B

POSTAL CARD INFORMATION

Number of _____ school _____

() My staff and I will not be able to participate.

POSTAL CARD INFORMATION

The information on the postal card sent to the
laboratory nursery schools directors was the following:

Name _____

University _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

- () I am willing or have my staff to cooperate in the survey
by completing a checklist of tasks expected and/or
required of student teachers in preschool education.

— Number of teachers in the laboratory nursery school
supervising student teachers in the preschool program.

- () My staff and I will not be able to participate.

The University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

March 1, 1970

Helene M.
School of Home Economics
Miss Linda L. Hunt
Box 27400
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Dear Nursery School Director:

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Thank you for your response to our survey of specific nursery school teachers in a university laboratory nursery school.

I am enclosing the questionnaire, checklist of books, and self-addressed envelopes according to the number of supervising teachers included in your response. Your help in distributing these materials to your supervising teachers and returning them to me at the earliest possible date is much appreciated.

The survey will include about seventy laboratory schools. When the study has been completed by the Spring of 1970, copies of the results will be made available to you.

Your response and cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Miss Linda L. Hunt
Graduate Assistant

Dr. Helen Gussidy
Assistant Professor
Home Economics

The University of North Carolina
at Greensboro

March 3, 1970

Return to:
School of Home Economics
Miss Lynda K. Weant
Box 37 Stone Bld.
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina
27412

Dear Nursery School Director:

Thank you for showing a willingness to cooperate in my survey of specific tasks required and expected of student teachers in a university or college laboratory nursery school.

I am enclosing the questionnaires, checklists of tasks, and self-addressed envelopes according to the number of supervising teachers included in your program. Your help in distributing these materials to your supervising teachers and returning them to me at the earliest possible date is much appreciated.

The survey will include about seventy laboratory schools. When the study has been completed by the Spring of 1970, copies of the results will be made available to you.

Your response and cooperation is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Miss Lynda K. Weant
Graduate Assistant

Dr. Helen Canaday
Associate Professor
Home Economics

1. Name of the university or college where you are currently attending
2. Current address
3. Age of the respondent
4. Name of the supervising teacher
5. Educational background of the supervising teacher
 - B.A. or B.S. _____ Major _____
 - M.A. or M.S. _____ Major _____
 - Ph.D. or Ed.D. _____ Major _____

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

6. Indicate the number of years you have been in the field of education.
 - 1-5 yrs. _____
 - 6-10 yrs. _____
 - 11-15 yrs. _____
 - 16-20 yrs. _____
 - 21-25 yrs. _____
 - 26-30 yrs. _____
 - 31-35 yrs. _____
 - 36-40 yrs. _____
 - 41-45 yrs. _____
 - 46-50 yrs. _____
 - 51-55 yrs. _____
 - 56-60 yrs. _____
 - 61-65 yrs. _____
 - 66-70 yrs. _____
 - 71-75 yrs. _____
 - 76-80 yrs. _____
 - 81-85 yrs. _____
 - 86-90 yrs. _____
 - 91-95 yrs. _____
 - 96-100 yrs. _____
7. Indicate the number of different positions you have held in the field of education.
 - One year only _____
 - Two year only _____
 - Three year only _____
 - Four year only _____
 - Five year only _____
 - Six year only _____
 - Seven year only _____
 - Eight year only _____
 - Nine year only _____
 - Ten year only _____
 - Eleven year only _____
 - Twelve year only _____
 - Thirteen year only _____
 - Fourteen year only _____
 - Fifteen year only _____
 - Sixteen year only _____
 - Seventeen year only _____
 - Eighteen year only _____
 - Nineteen year only _____
 - Twenty year only _____
 - Twenty one year only _____
 - Twenty two year only _____
 - Twenty three year only _____
 - Twenty four year only _____
 - Twenty five year only _____
 - Twenty six year only _____
 - Twenty seven year only _____
 - Twenty eight year only _____
 - Twenty nine year only _____
 - Thirty year only _____
 - Thirty one year only _____
 - Thirty two year only _____
 - Thirty three year only _____
 - Thirty four year only _____
 - Thirty five year only _____
 - Thirty six year only _____
 - Thirty seven year only _____
 - Thirty eight year only _____
 - Thirty nine year only _____
 - Forty year only _____
 - Forty one year only _____
 - Forty two year only _____
 - Forty three year only _____
 - Forty four year only _____
 - Forty five year only _____
 - Forty six year only _____
 - Forty seven year only _____
 - Forty eight year only _____
 - Forty nine year only _____
 - Fifty year only _____
 - Fifty one year only _____
 - Fifty two year only _____
 - Fifty three year only _____
 - Fifty four year only _____
 - Fifty five year only _____
 - Fifty six year only _____
 - Fifty seven year only _____
 - Fifty eight year only _____
 - Fifty nine year only _____
 - Sixty year only _____
 - Sixty one year only _____
 - Sixty two year only _____
 - Sixty three year only _____
 - Sixty four year only _____
 - Sixty five year only _____
 - Sixty six year only _____
 - Sixty seven year only _____
 - Sixty eight year only _____
 - Sixty nine year only _____
 - Seventy year only _____
 - Seventy one year only _____
 - Seventy two year only _____
 - Seventy three year only _____
 - Seventy four year only _____
 - Seventy five year only _____
 - Seventy six year only _____
 - Seventy seven year only _____
 - Seventy eight year only _____
 - Seventy nine year only _____
 - Eighty year only _____
 - Eighty one year only _____
 - Eighty two year only _____
 - Eighty three year only _____
 - Eighty four year only _____
 - Eighty five year only _____
 - Eighty six year only _____
 - Eighty seven year only _____
 - Eighty eight year only _____
 - Eighty nine year only _____
 - Ninety year only _____
 - Ninety one year only _____
 - Ninety two year only _____
 - Ninety three year only _____
 - Ninety four year only _____
 - Ninety five year only _____
 - Ninety six year only _____
 - Ninety seven year only _____
 - Ninety eight year only _____
 - Ninety nine year only _____
 - Hundred year only _____
8. Indicate the number of different positions you have held in the field of education.
 - One year only _____
 - Two year only _____
 - Three year only _____
 - Four year only _____
 - Five year only _____
 - Six year only _____
 - Seven year only _____
 - Eight year only _____
 - Nine year only _____
 - Ten year only _____
 - Eleven year only _____
 - Twelve year only _____
 - Thirteen year only _____
 - Fourteen year only _____
 - Fifteen year only _____
 - Sixteen year only _____
 - Seventeen year only _____
 - Eighteen year only _____
 - Nineteen year only _____
 - Twenty year only _____
 - Twenty one year only _____
 - Twenty two year only _____
 - Twenty three year only _____
 - Twenty four year only _____
 - Twenty five year only _____
 - Twenty six year only _____
 - Twenty seven year only _____
 - Twenty eight year only _____
 - Twenty nine year only _____
 - Thirty year only _____
 - Thirty one year only _____
 - Thirty two year only _____
 - Thirty three year only _____
 - Thirty four year only _____
 - Thirty five year only _____
 - Thirty six year only _____
 - Thirty seven year only _____
 - Thirty eight year only _____
 - Thirty nine year only _____
 - Forty year only _____
 - Forty one year only _____
 - Forty two year only _____
 - Forty three year only _____
 - Forty four year only _____
 - Forty five year only _____
 - Forty six year only _____
 - Forty seven year only _____
 - Forty eight year only _____
 - Forty nine year only _____
 - Fifty year only _____
 - Fifty one year only _____
 - Fifty two year only _____
 - Fifty three year only _____
 - Fifty four year only _____
 - Fifty five year only _____
 - Fifty six year only _____
 - Fifty seven year only _____
 - Fifty eight year only _____
 - Fifty nine year only _____
 - Sixty year only _____
 - Sixty one year only _____
 - Sixty two year only _____
 - Sixty three year only _____
 - Sixty four year only _____
 - Sixty five year only _____
 - Sixty six year only _____
 - Sixty seven year only _____
 - Sixty eight year only _____
 - Sixty nine year only _____
 - Seventy year only _____
 - Seventy one year only _____
 - Seventy two year only _____
 - Seventy three year only _____
 - Seventy four year only _____
 - Seventy five year only _____
 - Seventy six year only _____
 - Seventy seven year only _____
 - Seventy eight year only _____
 - Seventy nine year only _____
 - Eighty year only _____
 - Eighty one year only _____
 - Eighty two year only _____
 - Eighty three year only _____
 - Eighty four year only _____
 - Eighty five year only _____
 - Eighty six year only _____
 - Eighty seven year only _____
 - Eighty eight year only _____
 - Eighty nine year only _____
 - Ninety year only _____
 - Ninety one year only _____
 - Ninety two year only _____
 - Ninety three year only _____
 - Ninety four year only _____
 - Ninety five year only _____
 - Ninety six year only _____
 - Ninety seven year only _____
 - Ninety eight year only _____
 - Ninety nine year only _____
 - Hundred year only _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of the university or college nursery school _____.
2. Correct address _____.
3. Name of the director _____.
4. Name of the supervising teacher _____.
5. Educational background of the supervising teacher:

B.A. or B.S.	_____	Major	_____	Year	_____.
M.A. or M.S.	_____	Major	_____	Year	_____.
Ph. D. or Ed. D.	_____	Major	_____	Year	_____.
6. Experience as supervising teacher of the nursery school:

1-5 yrs. _____ 6-10 yrs. _____ 11-15 yrs. _____ 16 yrs. _____.
7. The program: Indicate the items which best describe your current laboratory program.

No. hrs. per day No. days per week No. of children

Ages of children in mos.

8. Indicate the number of different groups of children that you are currently responsible for in the first column; Indicate the different groups that the student teachers work with in the second column.

Toddlers	_____	_____
Two year olds	_____	_____
Three year olds	_____	_____
Four year olds	_____	_____
Culturally deprived	_____	_____
Emotionally disturbed	_____	_____
Mentally retarded	_____	_____
Socially and economically deprived	_____	_____
Special education	_____	_____
Church school	_____	_____
Other (Designate below)	_____	_____

9. Student teachers: Indicate the number of student teachers who presently participate in your laboratory program _____.

The maximum number that could enroll _____.

The minimum number that might enroll _____.

10. Indicate the number of hours of contact with the children that are required of the student teachers each week. _____.

For how many weeks? _____.

11. Of the student teachers currently enrolled, indicate their class level and the number at each level:

	No.
Freshman	_____
Sophomore	_____
Junior	_____
Senior	_____

12. Indicate the number of semesters _____ or quarters _____ of student teaching required for a degree.
13. Indicate the number of credits given for the course _____.
14. Indicate the length of time that the student teachers are required to serve as lead teachers _____.
15. Do the student teachers choose a specific theme or themes for activities during their period as lead teacher? yes___ no___.
16. Do the student teachers teach under constant supervision? yes___ no___.
17. Indicate the number of staff members and other adults in your laboratory program. Indicate to the right of each position the number of hours each week that each participates.

Number:

Hours each week:

_____ Trained full-time teachers	_____
_____ Trained part-time teachers	_____
_____ Graduate student assistants	_____
_____ Undergraduate student assistants	_____

Number: (continued)	Hours each week:
_____ Student teachers	_____
_____ Cook	_____
_____ Janitor and/or maid	_____
_____ Parents	_____
_____ Others	_____
_____ Specify: _____	_____

18. In addition to the laboratory program, indicate any other responsibilities which the supervising teacher regularly performs.

_____ Undergraduate teaching
 _____ Graduate teaching
 _____ High school teaching
 _____ Personal research
 _____ Departmental research
 _____ Student research
 _____ Advising master's theses
 _____ Advising dissertations
 _____ Advising undergraduate majors
 _____ Home economics committee member
 _____ University or college committee member

GUIDE FOR CHECKLIST OF TASKS

Specific tasks which student teachers in a university or college laboratory nursery school could be engaged in are described on the attached checklist. For each task, the extent of the student teacher's participation in your particular program should be indicated as follows:

Required of all student teachers all of the time

(R. of all S. T.):

You always require a student teacher to be involved in this task.

Example: In your laboratory program, the student teacher must help in the direction of any activity.

Engaged in by the student teacher upon the supervising teacher's request (R. upon S. T. Request):

APPENDIX E

You plan opportunities for a student teacher to be involved in this task if the student teacher requests a need or shows special interest.

GUIDE FOR CHECKLIST OF TASKS

Example: In your laboratory program, there may be occasions when the student teacher needs more experience in the planning of transition periods between activities.

Engaged in by the student teacher upon the student teacher's request (R. upon S. T. Request):

You plan opportunities for a student teacher to be involved in this task if the student teacher requests a need or shows special interest.

Example: In your laboratory program, when the student teacher asks to help in the preparation of lunch, he may be given this opportunity.

Does not apply: You never involve the student teacher in this task.

Example: In your laboratory program, you may have parent conferences, but it is not feasible for the student teacher to conduct the conference or sit in on the conference.

Does not apply: This task never occurs in your laboratory program.

Example: In your laboratory program, you may not have parent conferences and, therefore, this task does not apply.

GUIDE FOR CHECKLIST OF TASKS

Specific tasks which student teachers in a university or college laboratory nursery school could be engaged in are described on the attached checklist. For each task, the extent of the student teacher's participation in your particular program should be indicated as follows:

Required of all student teachers all of the time
(R. of all S. T.):

You always require a student teacher to be involved in this task.

Example: In your laboratory program, the student teacher must help in the direction of art activity.

Engaged in by the student teacher upon the supervising teacher request (E. upon Sup. T. Request):
You plan opportunities for a student teacher to be involved in this task due to individual need.

Example: In your laboratory program, there may be occasions when the student teacher needs more experience in the planning of transition periods between activities.

Engaged in by the student teacher upon the student teacher's request (E. upon S. T. Request):
You plan opportunities for a student teacher to be involved in this task if the student teacher requests a need or shows special interest.

Example: In your laboratory program, when the student teacher asks to help in the preparation of lunch, he may be given this opportunity.

Never experienced: You never involve the student teacher in this task.

Example: In your laboratory program, you may have parent conferences, but it is not feasible for the student teacher to conduct the conference nor sit in on the conference.

Does not apply: This task never occurs in your laboratory program.

Example: In your laboratory program, you may not have parent conferences and, therefore, this task does not apply.

CHECKLIST OF TASKS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Directions: Put a check mark in one of the columns to indicate your current practice for each task.

APPENDIX F

CHECKLIST OF TASKS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

A. Creative activity or experience

1. Arrange bulletin board as a special learning activity for the children

2. Arrange bulletin board using the children's art work and pictures

3. Arrange a parent's shelf of literature on child development or child rearing

4. Write articles for the nursery school bulletin

5. Write progress reports of the children

6. Participate in a parent conference

CHECKLIST OF TASKS FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Directions: Put a check mark in one of the columns to indicate your current practice for each task.

Description of Tasks	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
A. Creative activity or experience					
1. Arrange bulletin board as a special learning activity for the children					
2. Arrange bulletin board using the children's art work and pictures					
3. Arrange a parent's shelf of literature on child development or child rearing					
4. Write articles for the nursery school bulletin					
5. Write progress reports of the children					
6. Participate in a parent conference					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
7. Observe a parent conference					
8. Attend a parent's meeting--includes the nursery school staff and parents of the nursery school children					
9. Attend professional conferences with the supervising teacher					
10. Make home visits to one or more nursery school children					
11. Fulfill reading requirements of the student teacher curriculum					
12. Create a teaching aid					
B. Food service					
1. Sponge the tables in preparation for juice or snack					
2. Help in the preparation of juice or snack					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
3. Help in setting the tables for lunch					
4. Help in the service of lunch					
5. Eat at the table with the children as teacher					
6. Help buy groceries					
C. Care and cleaning of equipment and supplies					
1. Fill containers for water play activity					
2. Sponge the table after water play					
3. Mop water from the floor after water play					
4. Place wet towels or rag rugs in suitable place for drying					
5. Clean housekeeping area					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
6. Put away dress-up clothes after use					
7. Clean the lavatories and/or sinks at the end of the day					
8. Clean lockers					
9. Take cots or mats from storage areas to usual resting place and return them after rest					
10. Water indoor plants					
11. Feed and water pets					
12. Clean block and toy storage shelves					
13. Care for books					
14. Care for the yard					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
15. Get tricycles and wheel toys from storage area and return them after use					
16. Oil tricycles and wagons					
17. Sweep sidewalk and wheel toy area					
18. Clear sidewalks of snow and ice					
19. Get sand toys from storage area and return them after use					
20. Get out and put away woodworking materials					
21. Arrange doll corner or housekeeping area					
22. Mix play dough					
23. Mix tempera paints					
24. Prepare soap paint using egg beaters					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
25. Prepare art area for easel painting					
26. Mix natural clay and store for future use					
27. Prepare art area for finger painting					
28. Prepare art area for coloring, pasting					
29. Clean art area after activity					
D. Planning					
1. Be responsible for the planning and distribution of the nursery school bulletin					
2. Plan a parent conference					
3. Plan a children's library, bookshelf or rack					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
4. Plan table and area for water play activity					
5. Plan arrangement of outdoor play equipment					
6. Plan arrangement of table for manipulative toys					
7. Plan a field trip or excursion					
8. Plan a daily schedule					
9. Plan a source file					
10. Plan a resource unit					
11. Plan a weekly schedule					
12. Plan a monthly schedule					
13. Plan a curriculum guide					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
14. Plan a music experience					
15. Plan a creative dramatics experience					
16. Plan a nature or science center					
17. Plan a main center of interest for the room					
18. Plan for transition periods in the changing of activities					
19. Plan rest time					
E. Supervision					
1. Supervise health check in the morning					
2. Supervise rest time					
3. Supervise a music experience					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
4. Conduct a "concept learning" experience					
5. Conduct an art experience					
6. Direct outdoor play					
7. Supervise a field trip or excursion					
8. Supervise a daily schedule					
9. Supervise a weekly schedule					
10. Supervise a monthly schedule					
11. Direct a creative dramatics experience					
12. Direct a science experience					
13. Supervise transition periods between activities					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
14. Supervise the "free play" time					
F. Teaching techniques					
1. Aid an injured child					
2. Enforce limits established by the nursery school staff					
3. Explain rules and limits to the children					
4. Redirect children's actions					
5. Encourage children's actions					
6. Offer alternatives when there is a choice of action					
7. Initiate conversation between or from children					

Description of Tasks (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
8. Interrupt and direct a child's activity					
9. Anticipate problems and divert actions					
10. Use mild physical force					
11. Use strong physical force					
12. Use positive redirection					
13. Give reassurance, support, and comfort					
14. Set policies for the children					
15. Reinforce good behavior					
16. State expectations in a positive way					
17. Praise the child					

Description of Task (continued)	R. of all S. T.	E. upon Sup. T. Request	E. upon S. T. Request	Never experienced	Does not apply
18. Sing to the child for comfort					
19. Redirect aggressive activity					
G. Evaluation					
1. At the end of day evaluate each child's behavior for anecdotal record					
2. Evaluate student participation experiences at the end of the day					
3. Evaluate own student teaching experience					

Description of Tasks (continued)

R. of all S. T.
E. upon Sup. T. Request
E. upon S. T. Request
Never experienced
Does not apply

If there are other tasks in your laboratory program in which the student teachers participate, please add them in the spaces provided below. Be sure to put a check mark in one of the columns to indicate your current practice for each task.

If there are other tasks which you feel should be included in the student teacher's experience please add them in the space provided below. Also indicate recommended practice by putting a check mark in one of the columns for each task. Additional remarks may be added on the back.
